

NORMAL FORMS AND BIHOLOMORPHIC EQUIVALENCE OF REAL HYPERSURFACES IN $\mathbb{C}^3$

PETER EBENFELT¹

Department of Mathematics
Royal Institute of Technology
100 44 Stockholm, Sweden

2008-2-1

CONTENTS

1. Introduction
2. Finite nondegeneracy and holomorphic nondegeneracy
3. Normal forms and biholomorphic equivalence – the main results
4. Some applications and examples
 - 4.1. Computation of two fourth order invariants
 - 4.2. Everywhere Levi degenerate hypersurfaces
5. Regular coordinates and preliminaries
6. Proof of Theorem A (i)
7. Proof of Theorem A (ii); the beginning
 - 7.1. The setup
 - 7.2. The case $\Delta_{bc} = \Delta_{ac} = 0$
 - 7.3. The case $\Delta_{ab} = \Delta_{ac} = 0$
 - 7.4. The case $\Delta_{ab} = \Delta_{bc} = 0$
8. Proof of Theorem A (ii); the conclusion
 - 8.1. Two simple lemmas
 - 8.2. The case $\Delta_{ac} = 0$ and $\Delta_{ab}\Delta_{bc} \neq 0$
 - 8.3. The case $\Delta_{ab} = 0$ and $\Delta_{ac}\Delta_{bc} \neq 0$
 - 8.4. The case $\Delta_{bc} = 0$ and $\Delta_{ab}\Delta_{ac} \neq 0$
 - 8.5. Last case; $\Delta_{ab}\Delta_{ac}\Delta_{bc} \neq 0$
9. Proof of Theorem B
 - 9.1. The setup
 - 9.2. Conclusion of the proof of Lemma 9.1.18; the cases (A.i.1) and (A.i.3)
 - 9.3. Conclusion of the proof of Lemma 9.1.18; the case (A.i.2)

¹Supported in part by a grant from the Swedish Natural Science Research Council.

1. INTRODUCTION

As Poincaré [P] perhaps was the first to realize, a real hypersurface M in $\mathbb{C}^N$, when $N \geq 2$, has non-trivial local invariants under biholomorphic transformations of $\mathbb{C}^N$ near a distinguished point $p_0 \in M$. To understand the biholomorphic equivalence class of (M, p_0) , i.e. the class consisting of those real hypersurfaces $M' \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ with distinguished points $p'_0 \in M'$ that are locally equivalent to (M, p_0) under some germ of a biholomorphic transformation, is a fundamental problem. It is well understood in the case where M is real analytic and Levi nondegenerate at p_0 . The solutions are due to Cartan [C1–C2] in the case $N = 2$, and to Chern and Moser [CM] in the case of general N . Important contributions were also made by Tanaka [T1–T2]; see also [BS].

In contrast to the situation where M is Levi nondegenerate at p_0 , very little is known at Levi degenerate points. We should mention though that Webster, in [W], studied the equivalence under holomorphic contact transformations (a larger class of transformations than that of biholomorphic ones) of real hypersurfaces at Levi degenerate points; under such transformations, e.g., all Levi nondegenerate real hypersurfaces are equivalent. In the present paper, we shall consider real-analytic hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^3$ at Levi degenerate points of a certain kind. Together with the results of Chern-Moser, the results obtained here yield a fairly complete understanding of the biholomorphic equivalence problem at generic points on real-analytic hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^3$.

In [CM], two solutions of the biholomorphic equivalence problem for Levi nondegenerate hypersurfaces are given: an intrinsic solution in terms of classical objects of differential geometry and an extrinsic solution in terms of a normal form for M at p_0 . The extrinsic approach, which is also the approach taken in this paper, amounts to explicitly defining a class of real hypersurfaces $\mathcal{N}$ at $0 \in \mathbb{C}^N$ such that M can be transformed to one of the surfaces in $\mathcal{N}$ by a biholomorphic transformation $Z' = H(Z)$ near p_0 . Moreover, this transformation should be unique, given that a finite dimensional choice of normalization conditions (which in the Levi nondegenerate case can be identified with a choice of element in a classical group of rational transformations) for H are made. Having defined such a normal form, one obtains the following answer to the biholomorphic equivalence problem:

Two germs (M, p_0) and (M', p'_0) of hypersurfaces are biholomorphically equivalent (i.e. there is a germ at p_0 of a biholomorphic transformation $Z' = H(Z)$ such that $H(p_0) = p'_0$ and $H(M) \subset M'$) if and only if for two (possibly different) choices of normalizations they can be brought to the same normal form.

The results that we obtain in this paper can be described as follows. We consider the class of real-analytic hypersurfaces M in $\mathbb{C}^3$ that are 2-nondegenerate (see §2 for the definition) at a distinguished point p_0 . We first obtain a partial normal form for M at p_0 (Theorem A in §3) prescribing the lowest order terms (i.e. the data associated with 2-nondegeneracy) in the defining equation of M . This divides the class of 2-nondegenerate hypersurfaces into 8 different types, called (A.i.1–3), (A.ii.1–5) in Theorem A. Moreover, the types (A.ii.1) and (A.ii.3–5) come with one or two non-trivial invariants. We then obtain a complete, but formal, normal form, i.e. we obtain a class of formal hypersurfaces such that M can be transformed into one of these by a formal invertible transformation which is unique with a finite dimensional choice of normalization, for three of these types (A.i.1–3); see Theorem B in §3. This implies that any two germs (M, p_0) and (M', p'_0) of types (A.i.1–3) are

formally equivalent if and only if for two choices of normalizations the two can be brought to the same formal normal form. Now, in view of a theorem from [BER3] (see also §2), any formal invertible transformation taking a real-analytic, finitely nondegenerate hypersurface M into another such hypersurface M' is biholomorphic and, hence, formal equivalence of finitely nondegenerate hypersurfaces is the same as biholomorphic equivalence.

As we mentioned above, these results together with the results from [CM] give a fairly complete understanding of the biholomorphic equivalence problem for real-analytic hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^3$ at generic points, because a real-analytic hypersurface M in $\mathbb{C}^3$ is at a generic point $p \in M$ either (a) locally of the form $\tilde{M} \times \mathbb{C}$, $\tilde{M} \subset \mathbb{C}^2$, in a neighborhood of p , (b) 2-nondegenerate with one non-zero eigenvalue of the Levi form, or (c) Levi nondegenerate. (This will be further explained in §2). If M is foliated by complex curves as described in (a), then one may reduce the biholomorphic equivalence problem to one for hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^2$ where the problem is well understood (again, at generic points). If M is 2-nondegenerate at $p \in M$ with one non-zero eigenvalue of the Levi form at that point, then M is of one of the types (A.i.1–3); in fact, we show (Theorem 4.2.8) that if M is 2-nondegenerate at *generic points* (which implies that M is everywhere Levi degenerate), then M is of type (A.i.2) at every 2-nondegenerate point. Finally, if M is Levi nondegenerate at $p \in M$, then the Chern–Moser theory applies.

In §4, we discuss a few applications of the results in §3. We compute two invariants of fourth order for a real hypersurface of type (A.i.2) and consider holomorphically nondegenerate, but everywhere Levi degenerate, real-analytic hypersurfaces. We also discuss a few examples in this section, such as e.g. Freeman’s example [F] of an everywhere Levi degenerate hypersurface which is not foliated by complex curves.

2. FINITE NONDEGENERACY AND HOLOMORPHIC NONDEGENERACY

Let M be a real-analytic hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^N$ and let $p_0 \in M$. Following Stanton [S], we say that M is *holomorphically nondegenerate* at p_0 if there is no germ at p_0 of a holomorphic vector field

$$(2.1) \quad X = \sum_{k=1}^N a_k(Z) \frac{\partial}{\partial Z_k},$$

where the $a_k(Z)$ are germs at p_0 of holomorphic functions, such that X is tangent to M near p_0 . If $\rho(Z, \bar{Z}) = 0$ is a local defining equation for M near p_0 , then we say that M is *finitely nondegenerate* at p_0 if there is a positive integer k such that

$$(2.2) \quad \text{span} \{L^\alpha \rho_Z(p_0, \bar{p}_0) : |\alpha| \leq k\} = \mathbb{C}^N;$$

here, $L_1, \dots, L_{N-1}$ is a basis for the CR vector fields of M near p_0 ,

$$L^\alpha = L_1^{\alpha_1} \dots L_{N-1}^{\alpha_{N-1}},$$

and ρ_Z denotes the holomorphic gradient $\partial\rho/\partial Z$. This notion is independent of the choice of defining function, the choice of basis for the CR vector fields, and the coordinates used ([RHP]). Moreover, the smallest k for which (2.2) holds is

a biholomorphic (and formal) invariant and we say, more precisely, that M is k -nondegenerate at p_0 if k is the smallest integer for which (2.2) holds. As is easy to verify, M is Levi nondegenerate at p_0 if and only if M is 1-nondegenerate at p_0 .

Some of the main facts (whose proofs can be found in e.g. [BER1], where generalizations to higher codimensional CR manifolds also can be found) that we shall need about these notions can be summarized in the following proposition.

Proposition 2.3. *Let $M \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ be a connected real-analytic hypersurface. The following are equivalent.*

- (i) *There exists $p_1 \in M$ such that M is holomorphically nondegenerate at p_1 .*
- (ii) *M is holomorphically nondegenerate at every point $p \in M$.*
- (iii) *There exists $p_1 \in M$ such that M is finitely nondegenerate at p_1 .*
- (iv) *There exists a proper real-analytic subset V of M and an integer $\ell = \ell(M)$, with $1 \leq \ell \leq N - 1$, such that M is ℓ -nondegenerate at every $p \in M \setminus V$.*

We say that a connected real-analytic hypersurface is holomorphically nondegenerate if it is so at one point (and hence at all points). If M is holomorphically nondegenerate, then the number $\ell(M)$ provided by Proposition 2.3 (iv) is called the *Levi number* of M .

Before we turn to a discussion of real-analytic hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^3$, we wish to state two general results concerning transformations between finitely nondegenerate hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^N$. The first result (from [BER3]) will not be used in this paper, but it explains why finitely nondegenerate hypersurfaces seem to the right class of hypersurfaces for which one can hope to obtain a normal form. Recall that we would like the transformation of a germ (M, p_0) to normal form to be essentially unique (at least up to a finite dimensional normalization), and a transformation up to normal form can only be unique up to transformations preserving (M, p_0) (the stability group). It is not difficult to see that the stability group of a holomorphically degenerate hypersurface at a generic point is infinite dimensional (in fact, this is true at every point; see [BER2]). In contrast, we have the following result from [BER3] (cf. also [BER2]) for finitely nondegenerate hypersurfaces. We denote by $\text{Aut}(M, p_0)$ the stability group of M at p_0 , i.e. the group of germs at p_0 of biholomorphic transformations preserving the germ (M, p_0) , equipped with its natural inductive limit topology.

Theorem 2.4 ([BER3]). *Let $M \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ be a real-analytic hypersurface that is finitely nondegenerate at $p_0 \in M$. Then the stability group $\text{Aut}(M, p_0)$ is a finite dimensional Lie group.*

Remark. The arguments in [BER2–3] also give a bound on the dimension of $\text{Aut}(M, p_0)$ in terms of the complex dimension N of the ambient space and k , the order of finite nondegeneracy of M at p_0 . In the special case of a 2-nondegenerate hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^3$, this bound is $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \text{Aut}(M, p_0) \leq 102$. A consequence of Theorem B of the present paper is an improved bound on this dimension in case M is of either of the types (A.i.1–3) as described by Theorem A.

Another result, which will be important in this paper, is the following result from [BER3] that, as we explained in the introduction, reduces the problem of biholomorphic equivalence of two germs (M, p_0) and (M', p'_0) to that of formal equivalence. We say that an N -tuple of formal power series in $\mathbb{Z} \llbracket H(\mathbb{Z}) \rrbracket = (H(\mathbb{Z}) \oplus H(\mathbb{Z}) \oplus \dots)$

is a formal equivalence between $(M, 0)$ and $(M', 0)$ in $\mathbb{C}^N$ (with the obvious generalization to general points $p_0 \in M$ and $p'_0 \in M'$) if $H(Z)$ has no constant term, $H(Z)$ is invertible (i.e. the linear part of $H(Z)$ is invertible), and if there is a formal power series $a(Z, \bar{Z})$ such that

$$(2.5) \quad \rho' \left(H(Z), \overline{H(Z)} \right) = a(Z, \bar{Z}) \rho(Z, \bar{Z}),$$

where $\rho(Z, \bar{Z}) = 0$ is a defining equation for M at 0 and $\rho'(Z, \bar{Z}) = 0$ is a defining equation of M' at 0.

Theorem 2.6 ([BER3]). *Let M and M' be real analytic hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^N$ that are finitely nondegenerate at $p_0 \in M$ and $p'_0 \in M'$, respectively. If $H(Z)$ is a formal equivalence between (M, p_0) and (M', p'_0) , then $H(Z)$ is convergent i.e. there is a biholomorphic equivalence between (M, p_0) and (M', p'_0) whose power series coincides with $H(Z)$.*

Let us conclude this section with a discussion of hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^2$ and $\mathbb{C}^3$. In $\mathbb{C}^2$, a real-analytic hypersurface is either holomorphically degenerate or Levi nondegenerate at all points outside a proper real-analytic subset. If $M \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ is holomorphically degenerate, then it is in fact locally biholomorphic to a real hyperplane (this is not difficult to see). Thus, in $\mathbb{C}^2$ every real-analytic hypersurface is either biholomorphic to a real hyperplane or Levi-nondegenerate at generic points (and thus covered by the Cartan–Chern–Moser theory at such points).

However, already in $\mathbb{C}^3$ the situation is a little more complicated. If $M \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ is holomorphically degenerate, then at every point $p_0 \in M$ there is a holomorphic vector field X of the form (2.1) near p_0 that is tangent to M . Outside a proper real-analytic subset V of M near p_0 , the vector field X is nonsingular (i.e. at least one of the coefficients is non-zero). At such a point $p_1 \in M \setminus V$, it follows from the Frobenius theorem that M is foliated by complex curves and it is possible to choose coordinates near p_1 such that M is given locally as $\tilde{M} \times \mathbb{C}$, for some $\tilde{M} \subset \mathbb{C}^2$. Thus, at generic points on a holomorphically degenerate hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^3$ the biholomorphic equivalence problem may be reduced to the problem in $\mathbb{C}^2$. If $M \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ is holomorphically nondegenerate, then it is at generic points either Levi nondegenerate, in which case it is covered by Chern–Moser theory, or it is 2-nondegenerate. Hence, there is a gap between those hypersurfaces that can be studied by Chern–Moser theory at generic points and those for which the biholomorphic equivalence problem at generic points can be reduced to a lower dimensional problem. This observation was the original motivation for the present work.

As will be further discussed in the following sections, a real-analytic hypersurface M in $\mathbb{C}^3$ can *a priori* be 2-nondegenerate at a point $p_0 \in M$ in two different ways: the Levi form of M at p_0 has (i) one zero and one non-zero eigenvalue or (ii) both eigenvalues of the Levi form are zero. A moments reflection will convince the reader that outside a proper real-analytic subset of M , the Levi form has at least one non-zero eigenvalue because if both eigenvalues of the Levi form were zero on an open subset of M then M would be locally biholomorphic to a real hyperplane and thus, in particular, holomorphically degenerate. A closer analysis shows that the situation (i) occurs in essentially three different ways (A.i.1–3), and the situation (ii) in 5 different ways (A.ii.1–5), as we shall see in Theorem A. On the other hand, as we shall prove in Theorem 4.2.8, if M is everywhere Levi degenerate, then at a 2-nondegenerate point it must be of type (A.i.2).

3. NORMAL FORMS AND BIHOLOMORPHIC EQUIVALENCE – THE MAIN RESULTS

Let M be a real-analytic hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^3$ and let $p_0 \in M$ be a point at which M is 2-nondegenerate. We may choose coordinates $(z, w) = (z_1, z_2, w) \in \mathbb{C}^3$, vanishing at p_0 , such that M is described locally near $p_0 = 0$ by the equation

$$\operatorname{Im} w = \phi(z, \bar{z}, \operatorname{Re} w),$$

where $\phi(z, \bar{z}, s)$ is a real-analytic function with $\phi(0, 0, 0) = 0$ and $d\phi(0, 0, 0) \neq 0$. Our first result describes a partial normal form for (M, p_0) .

Theorem A. *Let M be a real-analytic hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^3$ and assume that M is 2-nondegenerate at $p_0 \in M$. Then (M, p_0) is biholomorphically equivalent to $(M', 0)$, where M' is a real-analytic hypersurface of one the following model forms.*

(i) *If the Levi form of M at p_0 has precisely one non-zero eigenvalue, then M' is one of the following:*

$$(A.i.1) \quad \operatorname{Im} w = |z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2(z_2 + \bar{z}_2) + \gamma(z_1^2 \bar{z}_2 + \bar{z}_1^2 z_2) + O(|z|^4 + |\operatorname{Re} w||z|^2),$$

where $\gamma = 0, 1$;

$$(A.i.2) \quad \operatorname{Im} w = |z_1|^2 + (z_1^2 \bar{z}_2 + \bar{z}_1^2 z_2) + O(|z|^4 + |\operatorname{Re} w||z|^2);$$

$$(A.i.3) \quad \operatorname{Im} w = |z_1|^2 + |z_2|^2(z_1 + \bar{z}_1) + O(|z|^4 + |\operatorname{Re} w||z|^2).$$

(ii) *If the Levi form of M at p_0 is 0, i.e. both eigenvalues of the Levi form are zero, then M' is one of the following:*

$$(A.ii.1) \quad \operatorname{Im} w = |z_1|^2(z_2 + \bar{z}_2) + r(z_1^2 \bar{z}_2 + \bar{z}_1^2 z_2) + O(|z|^4 + |\operatorname{Re} w||z|^2),$$

where $r > 0$;

$$(A.ii.2) \quad \operatorname{Im} w = |z_1|^2(z_2 + \bar{z}_2) + (z_1^2 \bar{z}_2 + \bar{z}_1^2 z_2) + i|z_1|^2(z_1 - \bar{z}_1) + O(|z|^4 + |\operatorname{Re} w||z|^2);$$

$$(A.ii.3) \quad \operatorname{Im} w = |z_1|^2(z_2 + \bar{z}_2) + (z_1 \bar{z}_2^2 + \bar{z}_1 z_2^2) + |z_2|^2(\lambda z_2 + \bar{\lambda} \bar{z}_2) + O(|z|^4 + |\operatorname{Re} w||z|^2),$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $\lambda \neq 0$;

$$(A.ii.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im} w = & |z_1|^2(z_1 + \bar{z}_1) + |z_2|^2(z_2 + \bar{z}_2) + (\mu z_1^2 \bar{z}_2 + \bar{\mu} \bar{z}_1^2 z_2) + \\ & (\nu z_1 \bar{z}_2^2 + \bar{\nu} \bar{z}_1 z_2^2) + O(|z|^4 + |\operatorname{Re} w||z|^2), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{C}$, $\mu\nu \neq 1$.

$$(A.ii.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im} w = & |z_1|^2(\eta z_1 + \bar{\eta} \bar{z}_1) + (z_1^2 \bar{z}_2 + \bar{z}_1^2 z_2) + \\ & (z_1 \bar{z}_2^2 + \bar{z}_1 z_2^2) + O(|z|^4 + |\operatorname{Re} w||z|^2), \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta \in \mathbb{C}$

Moreover, all of these models can be taken in regular form (see the next section) and then they are mutually non-equivalent, provided that we in (A.ii.4) arrange so that $|\mu| \geq |\nu|$ and $\arg \mu \geq \arg \nu$, where $\arg \mu, \arg \nu \in [0, 2\pi)$, if $|\mu| = |\nu|$.

Remark. The models described in Theorem A need not be in regular form (as described in §4) in order to be mutually non-equivalent. In fact, it suffices that the remainder in (A.i.1–3) is $O(|z|^4 + |\operatorname{Re} w||z|^2 + |\operatorname{Re} w|^2)$, or $O(4)$ in the weighted coordinate system where $z, \bar{z}$ have weight one and $\operatorname{Re} w$ has weight two, and that the remainder in (A.ii.1–5) is $O(|z|^4 + |\operatorname{Re} w||z| + |\operatorname{Re} w|^2)$, or $O(4)$ in the weighted coordinate system where $z, \bar{z}$ have weight one and $\operatorname{Re} w$ has weight three. This follows from the fact that if the equation for M is in regular form modulo terms of weighted degree ν , then the entire equation may be transformed to regular form without changing the terms of weighted degree less than ν . We refer the reader to the forthcoming book [BER4] for a proof of this.

The proof of Theorem A will be given in §5–8. As our second result, we present a complete formal normal form for (M, p_0) of types (A.i.1–3) above. In order to describe this result, we need to introduce some notation. We subject a germ $(M, 0)$, of either of the types (A.i.1–3), to a formal invertible transformation

$$(3.1) \quad z = \tilde{f}(z', w') \quad , \quad w = \tilde{g}(z', w'),$$

where $\tilde{f} = (\tilde{f}^1, \tilde{f}^2)$, such that the form (A.i.1–3) is preserved. We assign the weight one to the variables $z = (z_1, z_2)$, the weight two to w , and say that a polynomial $p_\nu(z, w)$ is weighted homogeneous of degree ν if, for all $t > 0$,

$$(3.2) \quad p_\nu(tz, t^2w) = t^\nu p_\nu(z, w).$$

We shall write $O(\nu)$ for terms of weighted degree greater than or equal to ν . Similarly, we speak of weighted homogeneity of degree ν and $O(\nu)$ for polynomials and power series in $(z, \bar{z}, \operatorname{Re} w)$, where $\bar{z}$ is assigned the weight one and $\operatorname{Re} w$ the weight two. A detailed inspection of the proof of Theorem A (i) (in §6) yields the following. We leave the details of this to the reader.

Proposition 3.3. *A transformation (3.1) preserving regular coordinates (see the next section) also preserves the form (A.i.1–3) if and only if:*

- (1) *In the case (A.i.1) with $\gamma = 1$, the mapping is of the form*

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{f}^1(z, w) &= z_1 + Dw - 2i\bar{D}z_1^2 + O(3) \\ \tilde{f}^2(z, w) &= z_2 + O(2) \\ \tilde{g}(z, w) &= w + 2i\bar{D}z_1w + O(4), \end{aligned}$$

where $D \in \mathbb{C}$.

- (1') *In the case (A.i.1) with $\gamma = 0$, the mapping is of the form*

$$(3.4') \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{f}^1(z, w) &= C^{1/2}e^{i\theta}z_1 + Dw - 2i\bar{D}e^{2i\theta}z_1^2 + O(3) \\ \tilde{f}^2(z, w) &= C^{1/3}z_2 + O(2) \\ \tilde{g}(z, w) &= Cw + 2i\bar{D}C^{1/2}e^{i\theta}z_1w + O(4) \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, $D \in \mathbb{C}$.

(2) In the case (A.i.2), the mapping is of the form

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{f}^1(z, w) &= C^{1/2} e^{i\theta} z_1 + Dw - e^{2i\theta} (2i\bar{D} + C^{1/2} \bar{A} e^{i\theta}) z_1^2 + O(3) \\ \tilde{f}^2(z, w) &= Az_1 + e^{2i\theta} z_2 + O(2) \\ \tilde{g}(z, w) &= Cw + 2i\bar{D} C^{1/2} e^{i\theta} z_1 w + O(4), \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, $A, D \in \mathbb{C}$.

(3) In the case (A.i.3), the mapping is of the form

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{f}^1(z, w) &= C^{1/2} z_1 + Dw - 2i\bar{D} z_1^2 + O(3) \\ \tilde{f}^2(z, w) &= C^{1/4} e^{i\theta} z_2 + O(2) \\ \tilde{g}(z, w) &= Cw + 2i\bar{D} C^{1/2} z_1 w + O(4), \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, $D \in \mathbb{C}$.

We shall consider formal mappings (3.1) of the following form

$$(3.7) \quad (\tilde{f}(z, w), \tilde{g}(z, w)) = (T \circ P)(z, w).$$

Here, $P(z, w)$ is a polynomial mapping

$$(3.8) \quad P(z, w) = (A_1^1 z_1 + Dw + Bz_1^2 + q_1(z, w), A_1^2 z_1 + A_2^2 z_2 + q_2(z, w), Cw + Ez_1 w),$$

where $A_1^1, A_1^2, A_2^2, B, D, E \in \mathbb{C}$, $C > 0$, are such that $P(z, w)$ satisfies the conditions (depending on the form of $(M, 0)$) imposed by Proposition 3.3, q_1, q_2 are weighted homogeneous polynomials such that q_1 is $O(3)$ and q_2 is $O(2)$, and $T(z, w)$ is a formal mapping

$$(3.9) \quad T(z, w) = (z + f(z, w), w + g(z, w)),$$

where $f = (f^1, f^2)$, and g are formal power series in (z, w) such that f^1 is $O(3)$, f^2 is $O(2)$, and g is $O(4)$. We shall require that the polynomials q_1, q_2 , and the formal series f^1, f^2, g satisfy additional conditions that will be different depending on which of the types (A.i.1–3) the germ $(M, 0)$ is.

If $(M, 0)$ is of the form (A.i.1) or (A.i.3), then we shall require that the polynomials q_1, q_2 in (3.8) are of the form

$$(3.10) \quad q_1(z, w) = Rz_1 w + \sum_{|\beta|=3} C_\beta z^\beta, \quad q_2(z, w) = \sum_{|\alpha|=2} D_\alpha z^\alpha,$$

for $C_\beta, D_\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}$, and that the formal series f^1, f^2 are such that the constant terms in the following formal series vanish (the index k below ranges over $\{1, 2\}$, α ranges over multi-indices with $|\alpha| = 2$, and β ranges over multi-indices with $|\beta| = 3$)

$$(3.11) \quad \frac{\partial^2 f^2}{\partial z_1^2}, \operatorname{Re} \frac{\partial^2 f^1}{\partial z_1^2}, \frac{\partial^3 f^1}{\partial z_1^3}.$$

It is straightforward (using ideas similar to those used in the proof of Theorem B in §9), and left to the reader, to verify that any formal mapping (3.1) that preserves the form (A.i.1) or (A.i.3) of $(M, 0)$ can be factored uniquely according to (3.7) with T and P as above. We shall say that a choice of P , as described above, is a choice of *normalization* for the transformations that preserve the forms (A.i.1) and (A.i.3), respectively, and that a formal mapping preserving the form has this normalization if it is factored according to (3.7) with this P .

Similarly, if $(M, 0)$ is of the form (A.i.2), then we shall require that the polynomials q_1, q_2 in (3.8) are of the form

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} q_1(z, w) = & B_1 z_1 w + B_2 z_2 w + \sum_{|\beta|=3} C_\beta z^\beta + \sum_{|\alpha|=2} D_\alpha z^\alpha w + \\ & E_1 z_1 w^2 + E_2 z_2 w^2 + \sum_{|\beta|=3} F_\beta z^\beta w + R z_1 w^3 \\ q_2(z, w) = & G_1 z_1 w + G_2 z_2 w + H_1 z_1 w^2 + H_2 z_2 w^2, \end{aligned}$$

for $B_k, C_\alpha, D_\beta, E_k, F_\beta, G_k, H_k \in \mathbb{C}$ and $R \in \mathbb{R}$, and that the formal series f^1, f^2 are such that the constant terms in the following formal series vanish (the indices j, k below range over $\{1, 2\}$, α range over multi-indices with $|\alpha| = 2$, and β range over multi-indices with $|\beta| = 3$)

$$(3.13) \quad \left\{ \begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial^2 f^j}{\partial z_k \partial w}, \frac{\partial^3 f^1}{\partial z^\beta}, \frac{\partial^3 f^1}{\partial z^\alpha \partial w}, \frac{\partial^3 f^j}{\partial z_k \partial w^2} \\ & \frac{\partial^4 f^1}{\partial z^\beta \partial w}, \operatorname{Re} \frac{\partial^4 f^1}{\partial z_1 \partial w^3}. \end{aligned} \right.$$

Any transformation preserving the form (A.i.2) can be factored uniquely according to (3.7) into such a P and such a T . We say that a choice of P , as described above, is a choice of *normalization* for the transformations preserving (A.i.2).

Now, suppose $(M, 0)$ is of one of the forms (A.i.1–3). We write the equation of M near 0 as follows

$$(3.14) \quad \operatorname{Im} w = |z_1|^2 + p_3(z, \bar{z}) + F(z, \bar{z}, \operatorname{Re} w).$$

Here, $p_3(z, \bar{z})$ is the homogeneous polynomial of degree 3 corresponding to the form (A.i.1–3), and $F(z, \bar{z}, \operatorname{Re} w)$ is a real-valued, real-analytic function that is $O(4)$. In what follows, we shall consider $F(z, \bar{z}, s)$ as a formal power series

$$(3.15) \quad F(z, \bar{z}, s) = \sum_{\alpha, \beta, k} c_{\alpha\beta}^k z^\alpha \bar{z}^\beta s^k$$

consisting only of terms of weighted degree greater than 3 (here, s is assigned the weight two) and subjected to the reality condition

$$(3.16) \quad c_{\alpha\beta}^k = \overline{c_{\beta\alpha}^k}.$$

We shall denote by $\mathcal{F}$ the space of all such power series. In order to describe the normal form we shall need to decompose such a power series $F(z, \bar{z}, s)$ according to type

$$(3.17) \quad F(z, \bar{z}, s) = \sum F_{kl}(z, \bar{z}, s),$$

where $F_{kl}(z, \bar{z}, s)$ is of type (k, l) i.e. for each $t_1, t_2 > 0$

$$(3.18) \quad F_{kl}(t_1 z, t_2 \bar{z}, s) = t_1^k t_2^l F_{kl}(z, \bar{z}, s).$$

In what follows, F_{kl}, H_{kl} , and N_{kl} denote formal power series of type (k, l) . We define the space of normal forms $\mathcal{N}^1 \subset \mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{N}^2 \subset \mathcal{F}$, and $\mathcal{N}^3 \subset \mathcal{F}$ for types (A.i.1), (A.i.2) and (A.i.3), respectively, as follows: First, $N(z, \bar{z}, s)$ is in *regular form* (see the next section for further discussion of this notion) which can be expressed by

$$(3.19) \quad N(z, \bar{z}, s) = \sum_{\min(k, l) \geq 1} N_{kl}(z, \bar{z}, s).$$

Moreover, the non-zero terms N_{kl} satisfy the following conditions. In the cases (A.i.1) and (A.i.3), for $j = 1, 3$,

$$(3.20) \quad \begin{aligned} N_{22} &\in \mathcal{N}_{22}^j, & N_{32} &\in \mathcal{N}_{32}^j \\ N_{42} &\in \mathcal{N}_{42}^j, & N_{33} &\in \mathcal{N}_{33}^j \\ N_{k1} &\in \mathcal{N}_{k1}^j, & k &= 1, 2, 3, \dots, \end{aligned}$$

where, for both $j = 1, 3$,

$$(3.21) \quad \begin{aligned} N_{11}^j &= \{F_{11} : F_{11} = z_2 H_{01} + \overline{z_2 H_{01}}\} \\ N_{22}^j &= \{F_{22} : F_{22} = z_2^2 H_{02} + \overline{z_2^2 H_{02}} + z_1 z_2 \bar{z}_1 \bar{z}_2 H_{00}\} \\ N_{33}^j &= \{F_{33} : F_{33} = z_2 H_{23} + \overline{z_2 H_{23}}\} \\ N_{21}^j &= \{F_{21} : F_{21} = \bar{z}_2 H_{20}\}, \end{aligned}$$

and furthermore

$$(3.22) \quad \begin{aligned} N_{31}^1 &= \{F_{31} : F_{31} = \bar{z}_2 H_{30} + \bar{z}_1 z_1^2 H_{10} + \bar{z}_1 z_2^3 H_{00}\} \\ N_{31}^3 &= \{F_{31} : F_{31} = \bar{z}_2 H_{30} + \bar{z}_1 z_1^3 H_{00} + \bar{z}_1 z_2^2 H_{10}\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$(3.23) \quad \begin{aligned} N_{32}^1 &= \{F_{32} : F_{32} = z_1^2 z_2 H_{02}^1 + z_2^3 H_{02}^2 + z_1^3 \bar{z}_2 H_{01} + z_1 z_2^2 \bar{z}_2^2 H_{00}\} \\ N_{32}^3 &= \{F_{32} : F_{32} = z_1 z_2^2 H_{02}^1 + z_2^3 H_{02}^2 + z_1^3 \bar{z}_2 H_{01} + z_1^2 z_2 \bar{z}_2^2 H_{00}\}, \end{aligned}$$

$$(3.24) \quad \begin{aligned} N_{42}^1 &= \{F_{42} : F_{42} = \bar{z}_2^2 H_{40} + \bar{z}_1^2 z_2^4 H_{00}^1 + \bar{z}_1 \bar{z}_2 (z_1^4 H_{00}^2 + z_2^4 H_{00}^3)\} \\ N_{42}^3 &= \{F_{42} : F_{42} = \bar{z}_2^2 H_{40} + \bar{z}_1^2 z_2^4 H_{00} + \bar{z}_1 \bar{z}_2 z_2^3 H_{10}\}, \end{aligned}$$

and finally, for $k \geq 4$,

$$(3.25) \quad \begin{aligned} N_{k1}^1 &= \{F_{k1} : F_{k1} = \bar{z}_2 z_1^k H_{00}\} \\ N_{k1}^3 &= \{F_{k1} : F_{k1} = \bar{z}_2 z_1^k H_{00}\} \end{aligned}$$

If $(M, 0)$ instead is of the form (A.i.2), then the terms N_{kl} satisfy the following

$$(3.26) \quad \begin{aligned} N_{33} &\in \mathcal{N}_{33}^2, & N_{43} &\in \mathcal{N}_{43}^2 \\ N_{53} &\in \mathcal{N}_{53}^2, & N_{44} &\in \mathcal{N}_{44}^2 \\ N_{54} &\in \mathcal{N}_{54}^2, & N_{55} &\in \mathcal{N}_{55}^2 \\ N_{k1} &\in \mathcal{N}_{k1}^2, & N_{k2} &\in \mathcal{N}_{k2}^2, \quad k = 1, 2, 3, \dots, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(3.27) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_{11}^2 &= \{F_{11} : F_{11} = z_2 H_{01} + \overline{z_2 H_{01}}\} \\ \mathcal{N}_{21}^2 &= \{F_{21} : F_{21} = \bar{z}_2 H_{20} + \bar{z}_1 z_2 H_{10}\} \\ \mathcal{N}_{31}^2 &= \{F_{31} : F_{31} = z_2 H_{21} + z_1^3 \bar{z}_2 H_{00}\} \\ \mathcal{N}_{22}^2 &= \{F_{22} : F_{22} = z_2 \bar{z}_2 H_{11}\} \\ \mathcal{N}_{33}^2 &= \{F_{33} : F_{33} = z_2 H_{23} + \overline{z_2 H_{23}}\} \\ \mathcal{N}_{43}^2 &= \{F_{43} : F_{43} = \bar{z}_2 H_{42} + \bar{z}_1^3 z_2^3 H_{10}\} \\ \mathcal{N}_{53}^2 &= \{F_{53} : F_{53} = \bar{z}_2 H_{52} + \bar{z}_1^3 z_2^4 H_{10}\} \\ \mathcal{N}_{44}^2 &= \{F_{44} : F_{44} = z_2^2 H_{24} + \overline{z_2^2 H_{24}} + z_1^3 z_2 \bar{z}_1^3 \bar{z}_2 H_{00}\} \\ \mathcal{N}_{54}^2 &= \{F_{54} : F_{54} = z_2 H_{44} + z_1^5 \bar{z}_2^2 H_{02}\} \\ \mathcal{N}_{55}^2 &= \{F_{55} : F_{55} = z_2 H_{45} + \overline{z_2 H_{45}}\} \\ \mathcal{N}_{k1}^2 &= \{F_{k1} : F_{k1} = \bar{z}_2 H_{k0}\}, \quad k = 4, 5, \dots \\ \mathcal{N}_{k2}^2 &= \{F_{k2} : F_{k2} = \bar{z}_2 H_{k1}\}, \quad k = 3, 4, \dots \end{aligned}$$

We are now in a position to state the theorem on normal forms for (A.i.1–3).

Theorem B. *Let M be a real-analytic hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^3$ given near $0 \in M$ in one of the forms (A.i.k), for $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, as defined in Theorem A. Then, given any choice of normalization (i.e. a choice of P as described above), there is a unique formal transformation (3.1) with this normalization that transforms the defining equation (3.14) of $(M, 0)$ to*

$$(3.28) \quad \operatorname{Im} w' = |z'_1|^2 + p_3(z', \bar{z}') + N(z', \bar{z}', \operatorname{Re} w'),$$

where $N(z, \bar{z}, s) \in \mathcal{N}^k$.

Remark. As already mentioned in the remark following Theorem 2.4 above, this result implies an improved bound on the dimension of the stability group $\operatorname{Aut}(M, p_0)$ of a 2-nondegenerate hypersurface M in $\mathbb{C}^3$ of either of the types (A.i.1–3). Counting the number of parameters in the normalizations, we find that in the case (A.i.1) with $\gamma = 0$ we have $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{Aut}(M, p_0) \leq 17$, in the case (A.i.1) with $\gamma = 1$ as well as in the case (A.i.3) we have $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{Aut}(M, p_0) \leq 19$, and in the case (A.i.2) we have $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \operatorname{Aut}(M, p_0) \leq 45$.

The proof of Theorem B will be given in §9. Combining Theorem B with Theorem 2.6 ([BER3]) and Theorem A, we obtain the following.

Corollary 3.24. *Let M and M' be real-analytic hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^3$ that are 2-nondegenerate and whose Levi forms have one non-zero eigenvalue at $p_0 \in M$ and $p'_0 \in M'$, respectively. Then (M, p_0) and (M', p'_0) are biholomorphically equivalent if and only if, for two (possibly different) choices of normalization as described in Theorem B, (M, p_0) and (M', p'_0) can be brought to the same normal form.*

4. SOME APPLICATIONS AND EXAMPLES

Before turning to the proofs of Theorems A and B, we shall discuss some applications of these theorems. Therefore, in this section, we shall assume that the results of §3 have been proved.

4.1. Computation of two fourth order invariants. Let $M \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ be a real-analytic hypersurface that is 2-nondegenerate at $p_0 \in M$. We shall assume that (M, p_0) is of the type (A.i.2) (see Theorem A) and compute two fourth order invariants, corresponding to the Taylor coefficients c_{22} and b_{22} in (4.1.2) below, for M at p_0 . In fact, the invariants will be formal invariants (and then, of course, also biholomorphic invariants) so, in what follows, we shall work with formal power series and formal transformations. In view of Theorems A and B, we may assume that the defining equation of M is

$$(4.1.1) \quad \operatorname{Im} w = |z_1|^2 + z_1^2 \bar{z}_2 + \bar{z}_1^2 z_2 + N(z, \bar{z}, \operatorname{Re} w),$$

where $N \in \mathcal{N}^2$. We write this in the form

$$(4.1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im} w = & |z_1|^2 + z_1^2 \bar{z}_2 + \bar{z}_1^2 z_2 + N_{31}(z, \bar{z}) + \overline{N_{31}(z, \bar{z})} + \\ & |z_2|^2(a_{22}|z_1|^2 + b_{22}z_1\bar{z}_2 + \bar{b}_{22}\bar{z}_1z_2 + c_{22}|z_2|^2) + \dots, \end{aligned}$$

where $a_{22}, c_{22} \in \mathbb{R}$, $b_{22} \in \mathbb{C}$, $N_{31} \in \mathcal{N}_{31}^2$, and where the dots $\dots$ represent terms in the power series that are either $O(5)$ or that are $O(4)$ and divisible by $\operatorname{Re} w$. We subject M to a formal invertible transformation (3.1) that preserves the normal form, i.e. that corresponds to another normalization of the transformation to normal form. Thus, the transformed formal hypersurface M' is defined by an equation of the form (4.1.1) that can be written in the form (4.1.2), in which the corresponding constants and functions are denoted with 's. We obtain the following equation for M' in terms of the transformation (f^1, f^2, g)

$$(4.1.3) \quad \begin{aligned} g - \bar{g} = & 2i(f^1\bar{f}^1 + (f^1)^2\bar{f}^2 + \bar{f}^2f^2) + \\ & 2if^2\bar{f}^2(a_{22}f^1\bar{f}^1 + b_{22}f^1\bar{f}^2 + \bar{b}_{22}\bar{f}^1f^2 + c_{22}f^2\bar{f}^2) + \dots, \end{aligned}$$

where the dots $\dots$ this time signify terms that will not influence the constants c'_{22} and b'_{22} . In order to compute c'_{22} and b'_{22} , we shall set $w' = 0$ and $\bar{w}' = \overline{Q}'(\bar{z}', z, 0)$ in (4.1.3), where $\bar{w} = \overline{Q}'(\bar{z}', z', w')$ is the complex defining equation of M' as defined in §5 below. By using Proposition 5.7 below and the form of $\mathcal{N}_{11}^2$, it follows that the coefficients of $|z_2|^4$, $|z_2|^2 z_1 \bar{z}_2$, and $|z_2|^2 z_1 \bar{z}_2$ in $\overline{Q}'(\bar{z}', z', 0)$ are $-2ic'_{22}$, $-2ib'_{22}$, and $-2i\bar{b}'_{22}$, respectively. By identifying coefficients on both sides of (4.1.3), in which we have set $w' = 0$ and $\bar{w}' = \overline{Q}'(\bar{z}', z', 0)$, we obtain

$$(4.1.4) \quad Cc'_{22} = c_{22}, \quad Cb'_{22} = e^{-2i\theta}(2Ac_{22} + C^{1/2}e^{i\theta}b_{22}),$$

where $C > 0$, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$, and $A \in D$ are as in Proposition 3.3. (A similar argument will be needed in the proof of Theorem A and explained in more detail there; we leave the details of the present identification to the reader). Defining

$$(4.1.5) \quad \operatorname{sgn}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{x}{|x|}, & x \neq 0 \\ 0, & x = 0 \end{cases}$$

it follows from (4.1.4) that: *the integer $\delta_{22} = \text{sgn}(c_{22})$ is a formal invariant of M* and, by choosing $C > 0$ suitably, we can make $c'_{22} = \delta_{22}$. It also follows from (4.1.4) that if $\delta_{22} \neq 0$, then we can make $b'_{22} = 0$. On the other hand, if $\delta_{22} = 0$, then the property $b_{22} \neq 0$ is an invariant. We may therefore define an invariant ϵ_{22} as follows: $\epsilon_{22} = 0$ if $\delta_{22} \neq 0$ or if $\delta_{22} = 0$ and $b_{22} = 0$, and $\epsilon_{22} = 1$ if $\delta_{22} = 0$ and $b_{22} \neq 0$. By choosing A , C , and θ suitably, we can make $b'_{22} = \epsilon_{22}$. Notice that we always have $\delta_{22}\epsilon_{22} = 0$.

Example 4.1.6. The preceding discussion implies that the following real hypersurfaces are mutually non-equivalent

$$\begin{aligned}
 (4.1.7) \quad M_1 &= \{ \text{Im } w = |z_1|^2 + z_1^2 \bar{z}_2 + \bar{z}_1^2 z_2 - |z_2|^4 \} \\
 M_2 &= \{ \text{Im } w = |z_1|^2 + z_1^2 \bar{z}_2 + \bar{z}_1^2 z_2 \} \\
 M_3 &= \{ \text{Im } w = |z_1|^2 + z_1^2 \bar{z}_2 + \bar{z}_1^2 z_2 + |z_2|^2 (z_1 \bar{z}_2 + \bar{z}_1 z_2) \} \\
 M_4 &= \{ \text{Im } w = |z_1|^2 + z_1^2 \bar{z}_2 + \bar{z}_1^2 z_2 + |z_2|^4 \}.
 \end{aligned}$$

4.2. Everywhere Levi degenerate hypersurfaces. We shall consider real-analytic, everywhere Levi degenerate, holomorphically nondegenerate hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^3$. In view of Proposition 2.3, such a hypersurface M is 2-nondegenerate at every $p_0 \in M \setminus V$, where V is a proper real-analytic subset of M . We assume that the results in §3 have been proved and apply these to (M, p_0) for $p_0 \in M \setminus V$. First, however, let us give a couple of examples of such hypersurfaces.

Example 4.2.1. (The light cone). Consider the real hypersurface M defined as the set of regular points of the cylinder in $\mathbb{C}^3$ over the light cone in $i\mathbb{R}^3$, i.e. the set of regular points of

$$(4.2.2) \quad (\text{Im } Z_1)^2 + (\text{Im } Z_2)^2 - (\text{Im } Z_3)^2 = 0.$$

All points $p \in M$ are equivalent via affine transformations. Let us consider M near the point $p_0 = (0, i, i)$. Setting

$$(4.2.3) \quad Z_1 = z_1, \quad Z_2 = i + z_2, \quad Z_3 = i + w,$$

we find that M is defined near p_0 , which in the above coordinates corresponds to $(z_1, z_2, w) = (0, 0, 0)$, by

$$(4.2.4) \quad w - \bar{w} = -2i + \sqrt{(z_1 - \bar{z}_1)^2 + (z_2 - \bar{z}_2 + 2i)^2}.$$

Now, Taylor expanding the square root on the right, making a suitable transformation to regular coordinates, and using the arguments in §6, we find that (M, p_0) (and hence (M, p) for any $p \in M$) can be transformed to a hypersurface in regular form that has the partial normal form (A.i.2); we omit the straightforward calculations. In particular, it follows that M is 2-nondegenerate (and thus Levi degenerate) at every point.

Example 4.2.5. (Freeman's hypersurface). M. Freeman gives in [F] the following example of a real hypersurface M in $\mathbb{C}^3$ whose Levi form has at least one zero eigenvalue at every point: M is the set of regular points of the real cubic defined by the equation

$$(4.2.6) \quad (\text{Im } Z_1)^3 + (\text{Im } Z_2)^3 - (\text{Im } Z_3)^3 = 0$$

As remarked in [S], the hypersurface M is holomorphically nondegenerate and hence, in view of Proposition 2.3, M is 2-nondegenerate on a dense open subset. Since (4.2.6) is independent of $\operatorname{Re} Z$, the germ (M, q) , for any $q \in M$, is biholomorphically equivalent to (M, p) , where $p \in M$ is of the form $p = (iX_1, iX_2, iX_3)$ such that $X_j \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$(4.2.7) \quad X_1^3 + X_2^3 - X_3^3 = 0.$$

A straightforward calculation shows that if $X_j = 0$, for any $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, then in fact both eigenvalues of the Levi form are zero. A closer analysis of the defining equation of M shows that M is 3-nondegenerate at such a point. At a point $p \in M$ where $X_1 X_2 X_3 \neq 0$, the calculations are more involved. However, using the software package *Maple* for some of the symbolic manipulations, we were able to verify that M at such a point is 2-nondegenerate with exactly one non-zero eigenvalue for the Levi form and, by following the proof of Theorem A (i) or applying Theorem 4.2.8 below, that M is of the type (A.i.2) at p .

The two examples above both have the same partial normal form, (A.i.2), at 2-nondegenerate points. The reason for that is the following.

Theorem 4.2.8. *Let $M \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ be a real-analytic hypersurface and $p_0 \in M$. If M is Levi degenerate in an open neighborhood of p_0 and 2-nondegenerate at p_0 , then (M, p_0) is biholomorphically equivalent to $(M', 0)$, where M' is of the form (A.i.2) as defined in Theorem A.*

Proof. We first prove Theorem 4.2.8 under the additional assumption that the Levi form of M at p_0 has one non-zero eigenvalue. Under this assumption, by Theorem A, (M, p_0) is equivalent to $(M', 0)$, where M' is of one of the forms (A.i.1–3). We assign the weight one to z and $\bar{z}$, and the weight two to w and $\bar{w}$. We write the defining equation $\rho' = 0$ of M' as follows

$$(4.2.9) \quad \rho'(z, w, \bar{z}, \bar{w}) = w - \bar{w} - 2i(|z_1|^2 + p_3(z, \bar{z})) + O(4) = 0,$$

where $p_3(z, \bar{z})$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree 3 (determined by the form (A.i.1–3) of M'), and $O(4)$ denotes terms of weighted degree 4 and higher. It is easy to verify that there is a basis L_1, L_2 for the CR vector fields on M' near 0 of the form

$$(4.2.10) \quad \begin{aligned} L_1 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_1} - 2iz_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{w}} + r_1(z, \bar{z}, w, \bar{w}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{w}} \\ L_2 &= \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_2} + r_2(z, \bar{z}, w, \bar{w}) \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{w}}, \end{aligned}$$

where r_1 and r_2 are $O(2)$ (cf. also (4.2.14) below). We obtain (with $Z = (z, w)$)

$$(4.2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho'_Z(Z, \bar{Z}) &= (-4i\bar{z}_1 - 2ip_{3,z_1}(z, \bar{z}) + O(3), -2ip_{3,z_2}(z, \bar{z}) + O(3), 1 + O(2)) \\ L_1 \rho'_Z(Z, \bar{Z}) &= (-4i - 2ip_{3,z_1\bar{z}_1}(z, \bar{z}) + O(2), -2ip_{3,z_2\bar{z}_1}(z, \bar{z}) + O(2), O(1)) \\ L_2 \rho'_Z(Z, \bar{Z}) &= (-2ip_{3,z_1\bar{z}_2}(z, \bar{z}) + O(2), -2ip_{3,z_2\bar{z}_2}(z, \bar{z}) + O(2), O(1)), \end{aligned}$$

where we use the notation

$$(4.2.12) \quad p_{3,z_1}(z, \bar{z}) = \frac{\partial p_3}{\partial z_1}(z, \bar{z}), \quad p_{3,z_1\bar{z}_1}(z, \bar{z}) = \frac{\partial^2 p_3}{\partial z_1 \partial \bar{z}_1}(z, \bar{z}), \quad \text{etc.}$$

The hypersurface M' is Levi degenerate in an open neighborhood $\omega \subset M'$ of 0 if and only if the three vectors in (4.2.11) do not span $\mathbb{C}^3$ for $(z, w) \in \omega$. Calculating the determinant $D(z, w, \bar{z}, \bar{w})$, we obtain

$$(4.2.13) \quad D(z, w, \bar{z}, \bar{w}) = -8p_{3,z_2\bar{z}_2}(z, \bar{z}) + O(2).$$

From (4.2.13) it follows that a necessary condition for M' to be Levi degenerate in an open neighborhood ω of 0 is that

$$(4.2.14) \quad p_{3,z_2\bar{z}_2}(z, \bar{z}) \equiv 0.$$

A direct calculation shows that M' , in this case, must be of the form (A.i.2). This completes the proof under the additional assumption that the Levi form of M at p_0 has a non-zero eigenvalue.

To complete the proof of the theorem, in view of Theorem A, we need only to verify that a real-analytic hypersurface M' of one of the forms (A.ii.1–5) cannot be Levi degenerate on an open neighborhood of 0. To do this, we assign the weight one to z and $\bar{z}$, and the weight three to w and $\bar{w}$. We write the defining equation of such a hypersurface as follows

$$(4.2.15) \quad \rho'(z, w, \bar{z}, \bar{w}) = w - \bar{w} - 2ip_3(z, \bar{z}) + O(4) = 0,$$

where $p_3(z, \bar{z})$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree 3 (determined by the form (A.ii.1–5) of M'), and $O(4)$ denotes terms of weighted degree 4 and higher. A similar argument (that we leave to the reader) to the one above shows that a necessary condition for M' to be Levi degenerate on an open neighborhood ω of 0 is that

$$(4.2.16) \quad p_{3,z_1\bar{z}_1}(z, \bar{z})p_{3,z_2\bar{z}_2}(z, \bar{z}) - |p_{3,z_1\bar{z}_2}(z, \bar{z})|^2 \equiv 0.$$

A direct calculation shows that none of the polynomials $p_3(z, \bar{z})$ in (A.ii.1–5) satisfies (4.2.16). This completes the proof. $\square$

By including the next term in the weighted homogeneous expansion of the defining function $\rho'(z, w, \bar{z}, \bar{w})$ in the calculation above, we would notice that the invariants δ_{22} and ϵ_{22} , introduced in §4.1 above, at a 2-nondegenerate point of an everywhere Levi degenerate hypersurface are necessarily both zero. Indeed, if we denote the term of weighted degree 4 by $F_4(z, \bar{z}, s)$, then such a hypersurface must have

$$(4.2.17) \quad F_{4,z_2\bar{z}_2}(z, \bar{z}, s) \equiv 4|z_1|^2.$$

Thus, none of the invariants we have computed explicitly can differ for such hypersurfaces.

For the proofs of Theorems A and B, we need some preliminaries.

5. REGULAR COORDINATES AND PRELIMINARIES

We shall say that $(z, w) = (z_1, z_2, w)$ are *regular coordinates* for (M, p_0) , where M is a real-analytic hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^3$ and $p_0 \in M$, if these coordinates vanish at p_0 and M can be described near $p_0 = 0$ by an equation

$$(5.1) \quad \text{Im } w = \phi(z, \bar{z}, \text{Re } w)$$

where $\phi(z, \chi, u)$ is a holomorphic function near $(0, 0, 0)$, real-valued for $(z, \chi, u) = (z, \bar{z}, s)$ with $s \in \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$(5.2) \quad \phi(0, \chi, u) \equiv \phi(z, 0, u) \equiv 0.$$

Such coordinates always exist (see e.g. [BJT] or [CM]). The equation (5.1) and the hypersurface M are said to be in *regular form* if (5.2) is satisfied. In the literature regular form and regular coordinates are sometimes called normal form and normal coordinates, but in this paper we wish to reserve the latter terms for special choices of regular form and regular coordinates satisfying additional conditions as explained above.

By writing $\text{Im } w = (w - \bar{w})/2i$, $\text{Re } w = (w + \bar{w})/2$, and solving for w in (5.1) using the implicit function theorem, we can describe the hypersurface M near $p_0 = 0$ by the complex equation

$$(5.3) \quad w = Q(z, \bar{z}, \bar{w}),$$

where $Q(z, \chi, \tau)$ is a holomorphic function near $(0, 0, 0)$. By complex conjugating (5.3), we find that we may also describe M by

$$(5.4) \quad \bar{w} = \overline{Q}(\bar{z}, z, w),$$

where we use the notation $\overline{h}(z) = \overline{h(\bar{z})}$. The fact that the equations (5.3) and (5.4) describe a real hypersurface can be expressed by

$$(5.5) \quad \overline{Q}(\chi, z, Q(z, \chi, \tau)) \equiv \tau.$$

Furthermore, equation (5.2) implies the following

$$(5.6) \quad Q(0, \chi, \tau) \equiv Q(z, 0, \tau) \equiv \tau \quad , \quad \overline{Q}(0, z, w) \equiv \overline{Q}(\chi, 0, w) \equiv w.$$

We shall refer to equations of the form (5.3) and (5.4), where (5.6) holds, as being in *complex regular form*. The following proposition is useful.

Proposition 5.7. *Let M be given in regular form by (5.1) and let (5.4) be a complex defining equation of M in complex regular form. Assume that $\phi(z, \bar{z}, 0)$ is $O(|z|^m)$. (Since $\phi(z, \bar{z}, s)$ is in regular form, we have $m \geq 2$.) If we write $\phi(z, \bar{z}, s)$ as*

$$(5.8) \quad \phi(z, \bar{z}, s) = \phi(z, \bar{z}, 0) + s\hat{\phi}(z, \bar{z}, s),$$

then

$$(5.9) \quad \overline{Q}(z, \bar{z}, 0) \equiv -2i \frac{\phi(z, \bar{z}, 0)}{1 + i\hat{\phi}(z, \bar{z}, 0)} + O(|z|^{2m+2}).$$

Proof. The function $\overline{Q}(\bar{z}, z, w)$ is obtained by solving for $\bar{w}$ in the equation (5.1). If we substitute (5.4) in (5.1) and set $w = 0$ (here and in what follows, we consider $(z, w, \bar{z}, \bar{w})$ as independent variables), then we obtain

$$(5.10) \quad \overline{Q}(z, \bar{z}, 0) = -2i\phi(z, \bar{z}, 0) - i\overline{Q}(z, \bar{z}, 0)(\hat{\phi}(z, \bar{z}, 0) + O(|z|^2\overline{Q}(z, \bar{z}, 0))).$$

In the last term on the right, we have used the fact that $\phi(z, \bar{z}, s)$ is in regular form to get the factor $|z|^2$. Since $\phi(z, \bar{z}, 0)$ is $O(|z|^m)$, we may solve for $\overline{Q}(z, \bar{z}, 0) \bmod |z|^{2m+2}$ in (5.10). The result is (5.9). $\square$

We have the following corollary that suffices for our purposes.

Corollary 5.11. *Let M , ϕ , $\overline{Q}$, and m be as in Proposition 5.7. Then, we have*

$$(5.12) \quad \overline{Q}(z, \bar{z}, 0) = -2i\phi(z, \bar{z}, 0) + O(|z|^{m+2}).$$

Proof. If $\hat{\phi}(z, \bar{z}, 0)$ is $O(|z|^n)$ then Proposition 5.7 implies

$$(5.13) \quad \overline{Q}(z, \bar{z}, 0) = -2i\phi(z, \bar{z}, 0) + O(|z|^p),$$

where $p = \min(m + n, 2m + 2)$. Since $\phi(z, \bar{z}, s)$ is in regular form, $n \geq 2$ and Corollary 5.11 follows. $\square$

In regular coordinates, the following vector fields constitute a basis for the CR vector fields on M near 0,

$$(5.14) \quad L_j = \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_j} + \overline{Q}_{\bar{z}_j}(\bar{z}, z, w) \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{w}} \quad , \quad j = 1, 2,$$

where, as above, we use the notation

$$(5.15) \quad \overline{Q}_{\bar{z}_j}(\bar{z}, z, w) = \frac{\partial \overline{Q}}{\partial \bar{z}_j}(\bar{z}, z, w).$$

It is easy to check that M is 2-nondegenerate at $p_0 = 0$ if and only if the following 5 vectors span $\mathbb{C}^2$

$$(5.16) \quad \overline{Q}_{z\bar{z}_1}(0, 0, 0) = (\overline{Q}_{z_1\bar{z}_1}(0, 0, 0), \overline{Q}_{z_2\bar{z}_1}(0, 0, 0))$$

$$(5.17) \quad \overline{Q}_{z\bar{z}_2}(0, 0, 0) = (\overline{Q}_{z_1\bar{z}_2}(0, 0, 0), \overline{Q}_{z_2\bar{z}_2}(0, 0, 0))$$

$$(5.18) \quad \overline{Q}_{z\bar{z}_1^2}(0, 0, 0) = (\overline{Q}_{z_1\bar{z}_1^2}(0, 0, 0), \overline{Q}_{z_2\bar{z}_1^2}(0, 0, 0))$$

$$(5.19) \quad \overline{Q}_{z\bar{z}_2^2}(0, 0, 0) = (\overline{Q}_{z_1\bar{z}_2^2}(0, 0, 0), \overline{Q}_{z_2\bar{z}_2^2}(0, 0, 0))$$

$$(5.20) \quad \overline{Q}_{z\bar{z}_1\bar{z}_2}(0, 0, 0) = (\overline{Q}_{z_1\bar{z}_1\bar{z}_2}(0, 0, 0), \overline{Q}_{z_2\bar{z}_1\bar{z}_2}(0, 0, 0)) ,$$

but the vectors (5.16) and (5.17) do not; if (5.16) and (5.17) span, then M is Levi nondegenerate (which is the same as 1-nondegenerate) at p_0 .

6. PROOF OF THEOREM A (i)

Let M be a real-analytic hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^3$ which is 2-nondegenerate at $p_0 \in M$ and whose Levi form at p_0 has exactly one non-zero eigenvalue. The first step is the following simple observation, whose proof is elementary and left to the reader: We may assume that (z_1, z_2, w) are regular coordinates for (M, p_0) and that the defining equation (5.1) of M at $p_0 = 0$ is of the form

$$(6.1) \quad \text{Im } w = |z_1|^2 + O(|z|^3 + |\text{Re } w||z|^2).$$

For the purpose of proving Theorem A, it is more convenient to work with the complex equation (5.4), which we write in the following way

$$(6.2) \quad \bar{w} = w - 2iz_1\bar{z}_1 + z_1(a_1\bar{z}_1^2 + 2b_1\bar{z}_1\bar{z}_2 + c_1\bar{z}_2^2) +$$

Here, and in what follows, we shall use the following convention when writing the complex defining equation of a real-analytic hypersurface: the dots $\dots$ signify terms of degree at least 2 in the unconjugated variables (z_1, z_2) and terms of total weight at least 4, where we assign the weight 1 to the variables $(z_1, z_2, \bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)$ and the weight 2 to $(w, \bar{w})$ as in §3. In view of Corollary 5.11, this allows us to reconstruct the real defining equation of the hypersurface modulo terms of weight at least 4. For example, equation (6.2) implies that the real defining equation of M is of the form

$$(6.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im} w = & |z_1|^2 + |z_1|^2 \frac{\bar{a}_1 z_1 - a_1 \bar{z}_1}{2i} + |z_1|^2 \frac{2\bar{b}_1 z_2 - 2b_1 \bar{z}_2}{2i} + \frac{\bar{c}_1 \bar{z}_1 z_2^2 - c_1 z_1 \bar{z}_2^2}{2i} + \\ & |z_2|^2 \frac{\bar{c}_2 z_2 - c_2 \bar{z}_2}{2i} + |z_2|^2 \frac{2\bar{b}_2 z_1 - 2b_2 \bar{z}_1}{2i} + \frac{\bar{a}_2 \bar{z}_2 z_1^2 - a_2 z_2 \bar{z}_1^2}{2i} + \\ & O(|z|^4 + |\operatorname{Re} w||z|^2). \end{aligned}$$

With $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{C}$, this is the most general form of a real equation of the type (6.1) in regular form. The 5 vectors (5.16–5.20) become

$$(6.4) \quad \overline{Q}_{z\bar{z}_1}(0, 0, 0) = (-2i, 0)$$

$$(6.5) \quad \overline{Q}_{z\bar{z}_2}(0, 0, 0) = (0, 0)$$

$$(6.6) \quad \overline{Q}_{z\bar{z}_1^2}(0, 0, 0) = (2a_1, 2a_2)$$

$$(6.7) \quad \overline{Q}_{z\bar{z}_2^2}(0, 0, 0) = (2b_1, 2b_2)$$

$$(6.8) \quad \overline{Q}_{z\bar{z}_1\bar{z}_2}(0, 0, 0) = (2c_1, 2c_2).$$

Thus, the fact that M is 2-nondegenerate is equivalent to (a_2, b_2, c_2) being different from $(0, 0, 0)$. We now make a biholomorphic transformation preserving the origin,

$$(6.9) \quad z = f(z', w') \quad , \quad w = g(z', w'),$$

such that the new coordinates (z', w') are regular for the transformed hypersurface $(M', 0)$. A complex defining equation for the transformed hypersurface is given by

$$(6.10) \quad g(z', w') = Q(f(z', w'), \bar{f}(\bar{z}', \bar{w}'), \bar{g}(\bar{z}', \bar{w}')).$$

It is straightforward to verify that coordinates (z', w') are regular for a hypersurface $(M', 0)$ if and only if for some defining equation (and hence for all defining equations) $\rho(z', w', \bar{z}', \bar{w}') = 0$ it holds that $\rho(z', w', 0, w') \equiv 0$. Thus, (z', w') are regular for $(M', 0)$ if and only if the relation

$$(6.11) \quad g(z', w') \equiv Q(f(z', w'), \bar{f}(0, w'), \bar{g}(0, w'))$$

holds. In particular then,

$$(6.12) \quad g(z', w') = w' \hat{g}(z', w'),$$

for some holomorphic function $\hat{g}(z', w')$. We shall write

$$(6.13) \quad \rho(z', w') = Q(w' + w' \hat{h}(z', w'), \bar{Q}(w' + w' \hat{h}(z', w')), h(z', w'))$$

where $C \neq 0$ is a real number, $h(z', w') = w' \hat{h}(z', w')$, and $\hat{h}(0, 0) = 0$. We also write, for $j = 1, 2$,

$$(6.14) \quad f_j(z', w') = A_1^j z'_1 + A_2^j z'_2 + D^j w + B_1^j z_1^2 + 2B_2^j z_1 z_2 + B_3^j z_2^2 + O(|z|^3 + |w|(|z| + |w|)),$$

where the determinant

$$(6.15) \quad A_1^1 A_2^2 - A_2^1 A_1^2 \neq 0.$$

We shall show that we can choose A_k^j, B_l^j, C, D^j such that the transformed hypersurface $(M', 0)$ is of one and only one of the model forms (A.i.1–3). This will complete the proof of Theorem A (i).

For notational brevity, we shall drop the ' on the new coordinates. By substituting (6.9) in (6.2), we find the following equation for the transformed hypersurface M'

$$(6.16) \quad C\bar{w} + \bar{h} = Cw + h - 2if_1\bar{f}_1 + f_1(a_1\bar{f}_1^2 + 2b_1\bar{f}_1\bar{f}_2 + c_1\bar{f}_2^2) + f_2(a_2\bar{f}_1^2 + 2b_2\bar{f}_1\bar{f}_2 + c_2\bar{f}_2^2) + \dots,$$

where we use the convention $\bar{f}_1 = \bar{f}_1(\bar{z}, \bar{w})$, $f_1 = f_1(z, w)$, etc. We also use the notation $\dots$ as explained above, i.e. for those terms that have degree at least 2 in the unconjugated variables (z_1, z_2) and terms that have total weight at least 4. The new coordinates are regular for the transformed hypersurface M' . We write the complex equation of M' in regular form, first as follows

$$(6.17) \quad \bar{w} = \bar{Q}'(\bar{z}, z, w),$$

and then

$$(6.18) \quad \bar{w} = w - 2i(r_1 z_1 \bar{z}_1 + r_2 z_1 \bar{z}_2 + \bar{r}_2 \bar{z}_1 z_2 + r_3 z_2 \bar{z}_2) + z_1(a'_1 \bar{z}_1^2 + 2b'_1 \bar{z}_1 \bar{z}_2 + c'_1 \bar{z}_2^2) + z_2(a'_2 \bar{z}_1^2 + 2b'_2 \bar{z}_1 \bar{z}_2 + c'_2 \bar{z}_2^2) + \dots,$$

We shall identify the coefficients r_1, r_2, r_3 , and $a'_1, b'_1, c'_1, a'_2, b'_2, c'_2$ using the equation (6.16). In order to do this we need to know the linear part of $\bar{h}(\bar{z}, 0)$. This part is not arbitrary, in view of (6.11). In fact, it follows from that equation that

$$(6.19) \quad \bar{h}(\bar{z}, 0) = -2iD^1(\bar{A}_1^1 \bar{z}_1 + \bar{A}_2^1 \bar{z}_2) + O(|z|^2).$$

If we now set $w = 0$, substitute $\bar{w} = \bar{Q}'(z, \bar{z}, 0)$ in (6.16), and use (6.19), we obtain the following equations for the new coefficients. The coefficients associated with the quadratic part of $\bar{Q}'(\bar{z}, z, 0)$ are given by

$$(6.20) \quad \begin{aligned} Cr_1 &= |A_1^1|^2 \\ Cr_2 &= A_1^1 \bar{A}_2^1 \\ Cr_3 &= |A_1^1|^2 \end{aligned}$$

We want to preserve the quadratic terms and, hence, we need to choose

$$(6.21) \quad C > 0 \quad , \quad |A_1^1| = \sqrt{C} \quad , \quad A_2^1 = 0.$$

We then get the following equations for the remaining coefficients

$$(6.22) \quad \begin{aligned} Ca'_1 &= A_1^1(a_1(\bar{A}_1^1)^2 + 2b_1\bar{A}_1^1\bar{A}_1^2 + c_1(\bar{A}_1^2)^2 - 2i\bar{B}_1^1) + \\ &\quad A_1^2(a_2(\bar{A}_1^1)^2 + 2b_2\bar{A}_1^1\bar{A}_1^2 + c_2(\bar{A}_1^2)^2) + 4D^1\bar{A}_1^1 \\ Ca'_2 &= A_2^2(a_2(\bar{A}_1^1)^2 + 2b_2\bar{A}_1^1\bar{A}_1^2 + c_2(\bar{A}_1^2)^2) \\ Cb'_1 &= A_1^1(b_1\bar{A}_1^1\bar{A}_2^2 + c_1\bar{A}_1^2\bar{A}_2^2 - 2i\bar{B}_2^1) + A_1^2(b_2\bar{A}_1^1\bar{A}_2^2 + c_2\bar{A}_1^2\bar{A}_2^2) \\ Cb'_2 &= A_2^2(b_2\bar{A}_1^1\bar{A}_2^2 + c_2\bar{A}_1^2\bar{A}_2^2) \\ Cc'_1 &= A_1^1(c_1(\bar{A}_2^2)^2 - 2i\bar{B}_3^1) + A_1^2(c_2(\bar{A}_2^2)^2) \\ Cc'_2 &= A_2^2c_2(\bar{A}_2^2)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|A_1^1| \neq 0$, we can make $a'_1 = b'_1 = c'_1 = 0$ without restricting the A_k^j further by a suitable choice of B_1^1 , B_2^1 , and B_3^1 .

Now, suppose first that $b_2 = c_2 = 0$. Then the new coefficients b'_2 and c'_2 are also 0. It follows that M is not biholomorphically equivalent to either of (A.i.1) or (A.i.3). Since M is 2-nondegenerate, a_2 must be non-zero. It is then easy to see that, by a suitable choice of A_1^1 , A_2^2 , and C , we can make $a'_2 = -2i$. Thus, in this case M is biholomorphically equivalent to (A.i.2) and not to either (A.i.1) or (A.i.3).

Next, suppose $c_2 = 0$ and $b_2 \neq 0$. The coefficient c'_2 remains 0 and b'_2 cannot be made 0 by a biholomorphic transformation. By a suitable choice of A_1^1 , A_2^2 , and C , we can make $b'_2 = -i$ and, by choosing A_1^2 accordingly, we can make $a'_2 = 0$. Hence, we can transform M to the form (A.i.3), but not to either of (A.i.1) or (A.i.2).

Finally, suppose $c_2 \neq 0$. Then, we cannot make $c'_2 = 0$ via a biholomorphic transformation. However, by choosing A_2^2 and C such that

$$(6.23) \quad -2iC = A_2^2(\bar{A}_2^2)^2c_2,$$

we can make $c'_2 = -2i$. We then make $b'_2 = 0$ by choosing $\bar{A}_1^2 = -b_2\bar{A}_1^1/c_2$. Substituting this in a'_2 , we find

$$(6.24) \quad Ca'_2 = A_2^2\bar{A}_1^1 \frac{a_2c_2 - b_2^2}{c_2},$$

where A_2^2 also satisfies (6.23) and $|A_1^1| = \sqrt{C}$. Now, either $b_2^2 - a_2c_2 = 0$, in which case $a'_2 = 0$, or $b_2^2 - a_2c_2 \neq 0$, in which case we can choose the argument of A_1^1 and $C > 0$ such that $a'_2 = -2i$. Thus, M can be transformed to the form (A.i.1), where $\gamma = 0, 1$ is completely determined by a_2 , b_2 , c_2 , and M cannot be transformed to (A.i.2) or (A.i.3). This completes the proof of Theorem A (i).

7. PROOF OF THEOREM A (ii); THE BEGINNING

7.1. The setup. Let now M be a real-analytic hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^3$ which is 2-nondegenerate at $p \in M$ and whose Levi form at p is 0. As in the previous

section, we let (z_1, z_2, w) be regular coordinates for M at p_0 . We write the complex defining equation (5.4) of M as follows:

$$(7.1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{w} = & w + z_1(a_1 \bar{z}_1^2 + 2b_1 \bar{z}_1 \bar{z}_2 + c_1 \bar{z}_2^2) + \\ & z_2(a_2 \bar{z}_1^2 + 2b_2 \bar{z}_1 \bar{z}_2 + c_2 \bar{z}_2^2) + \dots, \end{aligned}$$

We use here the same convention as in §3, namely the dots $\dots$ signify terms of degree at least 2 in the unconjugated variables (z_1, z_2) and terms of total weight at least 4. As in §3 we assign the weight 1 to the variables $(z_1, z_2, \bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)$, but here we assign the weight 3 to $(w, \bar{w})$. Equation (5.1) is equivalent to the real equation for M at $p_0 = 0$ being of the form

$$(7.1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Im } w = & |z_1|^2 \frac{\bar{a}_1 z_1 - a_1 \bar{z}_1}{2i} + |z_1|^2 \frac{2\bar{b}_1 z_2 - 2b_1 \bar{z}_2}{2i} + \frac{\bar{c}_1 \bar{z}_1 z_2^2 - c_1 z_1 \bar{z}_2^2}{2i} + \\ & |z_2|^2 \frac{\bar{c}_2 z_2 - c_2 \bar{z}_2}{2i} + |z_2|^2 \frac{2\bar{b}_2 z_1 - 2b_2 \bar{z}_1}{2i} + \frac{\bar{a}_2 \bar{z}_2 z_1^2 - a_2 z_2 \bar{z}_1^2}{2i} + \\ & O(|z|^4 + |\text{Re } w||z|^2). \end{aligned}$$

The first two vectors (5.16-5.17) are now 0 and the 2-nondegeneracy is expressed by the fact that

$$(7.1.3) \quad \overline{Q}_{z\bar{z}_1^2}(0, 0, 0) = (2a_1, 2a_2)$$

$$(7.1.4) \quad \overline{Q}_{z\bar{z}_2^2}(0, 0, 0) = (2b_1, 2b_2)$$

$$(7.1.5) \quad \overline{Q}_{z\bar{z}_1\bar{z}_2}(0, 0, 0) = (2c_1, 2c_2).$$

span $\mathbb{C}^2$. We now make a biholomorphic transformation (6.9) where (f, g) are as in §3, i.e. $f = (f_1, f_2)$ is of the form (6.14) and g is of the form (6.13) satisfying (6.10). In this section though, the coefficients D^j and B_l^j will not enter into the equations as we shall see. Also, a simple scaling argument shows that we may assume that $C = 1$ in (6.13). Subjecting $(M, 0)$ to this transformation we obtain a new real-analytic hypersurface $(M', 0)$ for which (z'_1, z'_2, w') are regular coordinates and which is given by the complex equation (6.17). We drop the $'$ on the coordinates and write this equation as

$$(7.1.6) \quad \bar{w} = w + z_1(a'_1 \bar{z}_1^2 + 2b'_1 \bar{z}_1 \bar{z}_2 + c'_1 \bar{z}_2^2) +$$

A straightforward calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
(7.1.7) \quad & a'_1 = A_1^1(a_1(\bar{A}_1^1)^2 + 2b_1\bar{A}_1^1\bar{A}_1^2 + c_1(\bar{A}_1^2)^2) + \\
& \quad A_1^2(a_2(\bar{A}_1^1)^2 + 2b_2\bar{A}_1^1\bar{A}_1^2 + c_2(\bar{A}_1^2)^2) \\
& a'_2 = A_2^1(a_1(\bar{A}_1^1)^2 + 2b_1\bar{A}_1^1\bar{A}_1^2 + c_1(\bar{A}_1^2)^2) + \\
& \quad A_2^2(a_2(\bar{A}_1^1)^2 + 2b_2\bar{A}_1^1\bar{A}_1^2 + c_2(\bar{A}_1^2)^2) \\
& b'_1 = A_1^1(a_1\bar{A}_1^1\bar{A}_2^1 + b_1(\bar{A}_1^1\bar{A}_2^2 + \bar{A}_1^2\bar{A}_2^1) + c_1\bar{A}_1^2\bar{A}_2^2) + \\
& \quad A_1^2(a_2\bar{A}_1^1\bar{A}_2^1 + b_2(\bar{A}_1^1\bar{A}_2^2 + \bar{A}_1^2\bar{A}_2^1) + c_2\bar{A}_1^2\bar{A}_2^2) \\
& b'_2 = A_2^1(a_1\bar{A}_1^1\bar{A}_2^1 + b_1(\bar{A}_1^1\bar{A}_2^2 + \bar{A}_1^2\bar{A}_2^1) + c_1\bar{A}_1^2\bar{A}_2^2) + \\
& \quad A_2^2(a_2\bar{A}_1^1\bar{A}_2^1 + b_2(\bar{A}_1^1\bar{A}_2^2 + \bar{A}_1^2\bar{A}_2^1) + c_2\bar{A}_1^2\bar{A}_2^2) \\
& c'_1 = A_1^1(a_1(\bar{A}_2^1)^2 + 2b_1\bar{A}_2^1\bar{A}_2^2 + c_1(\bar{A}_2^2)^2) + \\
& \quad A_1^2(a_2(\bar{A}_2^1)^2 + 2b_2\bar{A}_2^1\bar{A}_2^2 + c_2(\bar{A}_2^2)^2) \\
& c'_2 = A_2^1(a_1(\bar{A}_2^1)^2 + 2b_1\bar{A}_2^1\bar{A}_2^2 + c_1(\bar{A}_2^2)^2) + \\
& \quad A_2^2(a_2(\bar{A}_2^1)^2 + 2b_2\bar{A}_2^1\bar{A}_2^2 + c_2(\bar{A}_2^2)^2)
\end{aligned}$$

Before we start the proof of Theorem A (ii), we shall make a preliminary reduction. Note that the equation for b'_2 can be written

$$\begin{aligned}
(7.1.8) \quad & b'_2 = \bar{A}_2^2(b_1|A_2^1|^2 + c_1A_2^1\bar{A}_2^2 + b_2\bar{A}_2^1A_2^2 + c_2|A_2^2|^2) + \\
& \quad \bar{A}_1^1(a_1|A_2^1|^2 + b_1A_2^1\bar{A}_2^2 + a_2\bar{A}_2^1A_2^2 + b_2|A_2^2|^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, we can always choose A_1^1, A_2^1, A_2^2 satisfying (6.15) such that $b'_2 = 0$. We shall assume that we have already subjected M to such a transformation and, consequently, we shall assume in what follows that $b_2 = 0$.

When we make the transformation (6.9), we will want to keep $b'_2 = 0$. Thus, in view of (7.1.8), the transformation must satisfy the following relation

$$(7.1.9) \quad \bar{A}_1^2R(A_2^1, \bar{A}_2^1, A_2^2, \bar{A}_2^2) + \bar{A}_1^1S(A_2^1, \bar{A}_2^1, A_2^2, \bar{A}_2^2) = 0,$$

where we use the notation

$$\begin{aligned}
(7.1.10) \quad & R(u, \bar{u}, v, \bar{v}) = b_1|u|^2 + c_1u\bar{v} + c_2|v|^2 \\
& S(u, \bar{u}, v, \bar{v}) = a_1|u|^2 + b_1u\bar{v} + a_2\bar{u}v.
\end{aligned}$$

If A_2^1, A_2^2 are chosen such that

$$(7.1.11) \quad R(A_2^1, \bar{A}_2^1, A_2^2, \bar{A}_2^2) \neq 0,$$

then

$$(7.1.12) \quad \bar{A}_1^2 = -\bar{A}_1^1 \frac{S(A_2^1, \bar{A}_2^1, A_2^2, \bar{A}_2^2)}{R(A_2^1, \bar{A}_2^1, A_2^2, \bar{A}_2^2)}.$$

We may substitute this into the expression for b'_1 to obtain

$$(7.1.13) \quad b'_1 = -\bar{A}_1^1(A_1^1A_2^2 - A_2^1A_1^2) \frac{P_1(\bar{A}_2^1, \bar{A}_2^2)}{R(A_2^1, \bar{A}_2^1, A_2^2, \bar{A}_2^2)},$$

where

$$(7.1.14) \quad P_1(\bar{A}_2^1, \bar{A}_2^2) = -a_2 b_1 (\bar{A}_2^1)^2 + (a_1 c_2 - a_2 c_1) \bar{A}_2^1 \bar{A}_2^2 + b_1 c_2 (\bar{A}_2^2)^2.$$

If we assume that $A_2^2 \neq 0$, then we may write

$$(7.1.15) \quad \bar{A}_2^1 = \zeta \bar{A}_2^2.$$

We then use the notation

$$(7.1.16) \quad \begin{aligned} r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) &= |A_2^2|^{-2} R(\bar{\zeta} A_2^2, \zeta \bar{A}_2^2, A_2^2, \bar{A}_2^2) = b_1 |\zeta|^2 + c_1 \bar{\zeta} + c_2 \\ s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) &= |A_2^2|^{-2} S(\bar{\zeta} A_2^2, \zeta \bar{A}_2^2, A_2^2, \bar{A}_2^2) = a_1 |\zeta|^2 + b_1 \bar{\zeta} + a_2 \zeta \\ p_1(\zeta) &= (\bar{A}_2^2)^{-2} P_1(\zeta \bar{A}_2^2, \bar{A}_2^2) = -a_2 b_1 \zeta^2 + (a_1 c_2 - a_2 c_1) \zeta + b_1 c_2 \end{aligned}$$

so that the relation (7.1.9) becomes

$$(7.1.17) \quad \bar{A}_1^2 r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) + \bar{A}_1^1 s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = 0.$$

and, provided $r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) \neq 0$,

$$(7.1.18) \quad b'_1 = -\bar{A}_1^1 (\bar{A}_2^2)^2 (A_1^1 A_2^2 - A_1^2 A_2^1) \frac{p_1(\zeta)}{|A_2^2|^2 r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})}.$$

We introduce the determinants

$$(7.1.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_{ab} &= a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1 = -a_2 b_1 \\ \Delta_{bc} &= b_1 c_2 - b_2 c_1 = b_1 c_2 \\ \Delta_{ac} &= a_1 c_2 - a_2 c_1. \end{aligned}$$

so that the 2-nondegeneracy of M means that at least one of these is non-zero. The proof of Theorem A (ii) will be divided into different cases.

7.2 The case $\Delta_{bc} = \Delta_{ac} = 0$. In this case, we must have $\Delta_{ab} = -a_2 b_1 \neq 0$. Since the vectors (a_1, a_2) and $(b_1, 0)$ are linearly dependent, $\Delta_{bc} = \Delta_{ac} = 0$ implies that $c_1 = c_2 = 0$. Our first claim is the following assertion, which implies that M is not biholomorphically equivalent to either of the forms (A.ii.3–5).

Assertion 7.2.1. *If $b_2 = 0$, $\Delta_{bc} = \Delta_{ac} = 0$ and $\Delta_{ab} = -a_2 b_1 \neq 0$ then, after any biholomorphic transformation (6.9) satisfying (7.1.9), $a'_2 b'_1$ is non-zero.*

Proof. Note first that $R(A_2^1, \bar{A}_2^1, A_2^2, \bar{A}_2^2) = b_1 |A_2^1|^2$. Thus, to satisfy (7.1.9), either $A_2^1 = 0$ or (7.1.12) holds.

Suppose first that $A_2^1 = 0$. Then $b'_1 = |A_1^1|^2 \bar{A}_2^2 b_1$ and $a'_2 = (\bar{A}_1^1)^2 A_2^2 a_2$. This implies that b'_1 and a'_2 are non-zero, since $A_2^1 A_2^2$ must be non-zero to make (6.9) biholomorphic.

Next, suppose $A_2^1 \neq 0$. Then equation (7.1.12) holds, and b'_1 is given by (7.1.13). Since A_2^1 is assumed non-zero and $P_1(\bar{A}_2^1, \bar{A}_2^2) = -a_2 b_1 (\bar{A}_2^1)^2$, it follows that $b'_1 \neq 0$. The equation for a'_2 becomes, with the notation $R = R(A_2^1, \bar{A}_2^1, A_2^2, \bar{A}_2^2)$ and $S = S(A_2^1, \bar{A}_2^1, A_2^2, \bar{A}_2^2)$,

$$(7.2.2) \quad a'_2 = \frac{(\bar{A}_1^1)^2}{|A_2^1|^2} (A_2^1 (a_1 R - 2b_1 S) + a_2 A_2^2 R).$$

Since $A_1^1 \neq 0$ (A_2^1 has A_1^1 as a factor), a'_2 can only be 0 if

$$(7.2.3) \quad (a_1 A_2^1 + a_2 A_2^2)R - 2b_1 A_2^1 S = 0.$$

We claim this is not possible, because (7.2.3) implies that (6.9) is not biholomorphic. To see this, first observe that we cannot achieve (7.2.3) with $A_2^2 = 0$ unless $a_1 = 0$. On the other hand, if $a_1 = 0$, then $A_2^2 = 0$ implies $A_1^2 = 0$ which, in turn, implies that (6.9) is not biholomorphic. Thus, we may assume $\bar{A}_2^1 = \zeta \bar{A}_2^2$. The equation (7.2.3) becomes

$$(7.2.4) \quad (a_1 \bar{\zeta} + a_2)r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - 2b_1 \bar{\zeta}s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = 0.$$

A straightforward calculation shows that (7.2.4) is equivalent to

$$(7.2.5) \quad \bar{\zeta}(a_1 |\zeta|^2 + a_2 \zeta + 2b_1 \bar{\zeta}) = 0$$

Now,

$$(7.2.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{A}_1^1 \bar{A}_2^2 - \bar{A}_1^2 \bar{A}_2^1 &= \bar{A}_1^1 \bar{A}_2^2 \left(1 + \zeta \frac{s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})}{r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})} \right) \\ &= \frac{\bar{A}_1^1 \bar{A}_2^2}{r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})} (r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) + \zeta s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})) \\ &= \frac{\bar{A}_1^1 \bar{A}_2^2}{r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})} (a_1 |\zeta|^2 + a_2 \zeta + 2b_1 \bar{\zeta}) \zeta. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if the transformation (6.9) makes $a'_2 = 0$, then $\bar{A}_1^1 \bar{A}_2^2 - \bar{A}_1^2 \bar{A}_2^1 = 0$, i.e. (6.9) is not biholomorphic. This completes the proof of the assertion. $\square$

We shall now show that M is equivalent to either (A.ii.1), for some $r > 0$, or (A.ii.2). For that we need to make $b'_2 = c'_1 = c'_2 = 0$ and $b'_1 = -i$. As mentioned above, $b'_2 = 0$ if either $A_2^2 = 0$ or (7.1.12) holds. First, let us examine the case where $A_2^2 \neq 0$ and, hence, where (7.1.12) holds. It is straightforward to rule out the possibility $A_2^2 = 0$, because we cannot make $c'_1 = c'_2 = 0$ via a biholomorphic transformation with $A_2^2 = 0$. Let us therefore set $\bar{A}_2^1 = \zeta \bar{A}_2^2$. We obtain the following equations for c'_2 ,

$$(7.2.7) \quad \begin{aligned} c'_2 &= A_2^2 (\bar{A}_2^2)^2 (\bar{\zeta}(a_1 \zeta^2 + 2b_1 \zeta) + a_2 \zeta^2) \\ &= A_2^2 (\bar{A}_2^2)^2 (r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) + \zeta s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})); \end{aligned}$$

the last equality in (7.2.7) follows easily from the expressions (7.1.16) for r and s . Thus, if $c'_2 = 0$ then $r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) + \zeta s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = 0$, since we have already ruled out $A_2^2 = 0$. However, we also have

$$(7.2.8) \quad \bar{A}_1^1 \bar{A}_2^2 - \bar{A}_2^1 \bar{A}_1^2 = \bar{A}_2^1 \bar{A}_2^2 \left(1 + \zeta \frac{s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})}{r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})} \right).$$

We deduce that we cannot make $c'_2 = 0$ by a biholomorphic transformation if $A_2^1 \neq 0$.

If we choose $A_2^1 = 0$, then $b'_2 = c'_1 = c'_2 = 0$. Our next step is to make $b'_1 = -i$. With $A_2^1 = 0$, we have

$$(7.2.9) \quad b'_1 = |A_1^1|^2 \bar{A}_2^2 b_1,$$

so $b'_1 = -i$ is accomplished by

$$(7.2.10) \quad \bar{A}_2^2 = \frac{-i}{b_1 |A_1^1|^2}.$$

Substituting this in the expression for a'_2 , we obtain

$$(7.2.11) \quad a'_2 = i \left(\frac{\bar{A}_1^1}{|A_1^1|} \right)^2 \frac{a_2}{b_1},$$

By choosing the argument of $\bar{A}_1^1$ suitably, we can make

$$(7.2.12) \quad a'_2 = -2ri,$$

where

$$(7.2.13) \quad r = \frac{|a_2|}{2|b_1|}.$$

Thus, the number r is uniquely determined by a_2 and b_1 . We also have

$$(7.2.14) \quad a'_1 = \bar{A}_1^1 (A_1^1 (a_1 \bar{A}_1^1 + 2b_1 \bar{A}_1^2) + \bar{A}_1^1 A_1^2 a_2),$$

or with $\bar{A}_1^2 = \zeta \bar{A}_1^1$,

$$(7.2.15) \quad a'_1 = |A_1^1|^2 \bar{A}_1^1 (a_1 + 2b_1 \zeta + a_2 \bar{\zeta}).$$

We need the following lemma, whose proof is elementary and left to the reader.

Lemma 7.2.16. *The equation $L(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = 0$, where*

$$(7.2.17) \quad L(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = a_1 + 2b_1 \zeta + a_2 \bar{\zeta},$$

has a solution if and only if one of the following holds:

$$(7.2.18) \quad |a_2| \neq 2|b_1|,$$

$$(7.2.19) \quad a_2 = 2b_1 e^{i\theta} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{a_1}{a_2} e^{i\theta/2} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Moreover, if

$$(7.2.20) \quad a_2 = 2b_1 e^{i\theta},$$

then the range of $e^{i\theta/2} L(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})/a_2$ equals

$$(7.2.21) \quad \left\{ x + i \operatorname{Im} \left(\frac{a_1}{a_2} e^{i\theta/2} \right) : x \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

Writing $a_2 = 2rb_1e^{i\theta}$, with $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, and using that the argument of A_1^1 is chosen so as to make $a'_2 = -2ri$, we can rewrite (7.2.15) as follows

$$(7.2.22) \quad a'_1 = \pm i|A_1^1|^3|b_1|\frac{e^{i\theta/2}L(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})}{a_2},$$

where the plus or minus sign corresponds to which branch of the square root was chosen in defining the argument of A_1^1 . Now, if the invariant r , defined by (7.2.13) above, does not equal 1, then M is not biholomorphically equivalent to (A.ii.2). On the other hand, in this case (7.2.18) holds and, hence, $L(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ has a root. Consequently, we can make $a'_1 = 0$ and M is equivalent to (A.ii.1) with r defined by (7.2.13).

If the invariant $r = 1$, then (7.2.20) holds. Assume first that the additional condition in (7.2.19) holds. Then a'_1 is always purely imaginary, in view of Lemma 7.2.16 and (7.2.22), and it follows that M is not equivalent to (A.ii.2). On the other hand, in this case Lemma 7.2.16 also asserts that $L(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ has a root. Thus, we can make $a'_1 = 0$ and M is equivalent to (A.ii.1) with $r = 1$.

Finally, if (7.2.20) holds but not the additional condition in (7.2.19), then we cannot, in view of Lemma 7.2.16 and (7.2.22), make a'_1 vanish. Thus, M is not equivalent to (A.ii.1). On the other hand, by choosing ζ and the modulus of A_1^1 appropriately, and the plus or minus sign in (7.2.22) accordingly, we can make $a'_1 = -2$. It follows that M is equivalent to (A.ii.2). This completes the proof of Theorem A (ii) in the case $\Delta_{bc} = \Delta_{ac} = 0$.

7.3. The case $\Delta_{ab} = \Delta_{ac} = 0$. In this case, we must have $\Delta_{bc} = b_1c_2 \neq 0$. As in the previous case, the fact that $\Delta_{ab} = \Delta_{ac} = 0$ implies that $a_1 = a_2 = 0$. The first step is the following assertion, which shows that M is not equivalent to (A.ii.1), (A.ii.2), (A.ii.4), or (A.ii.5). The proof of this is very similar to the proof of Assertion 7.2.1 above, and is therefore left to the reader.

Assertion 7.3.1. *If $b_2 = 0$, $\Delta_{ab} = \Delta_{ac} = 0$ and $\Delta_{bc} = b_1c_2 \neq 0$ then, after any biholomorphic transformation (6.9) satisfying (7.1.9), $b'_1c'_2$ is non-zero.*

We are left with showing that M is equivalent to (A.ii.3) for precisely one choice of $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $\lambda \neq 0$. One possible way of satisfying (7.1.9) would be to choose A_2^1 and A_2^2 such that $R(A_2^1, \bar{A}_2^1, A_2^2, \bar{A}_2^2) = 0$ and $A_1^1 = 0$. However, it is easy to see that such a transformation leads to a hypersurface which is not of any of the forms (A.ii.1–5). The only alternative in this case is to choose $\bar{A}_1^2$ according to (7.1.12). In order for the transformation to be biholomorphic, we must also choose $\bar{A}_1^1 \neq 0$ and $\bar{A}_2^2 \neq 0$. We wish to make a transformation of this form such that $a'_1 = a'_2 = 0$. We set $A_2^1 = \zeta \bar{A}_2^2$ and substitute (7.1.12) in the equation for a'_2 . We obtain

$$(7.3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} a'_2 &= (\bar{A}_1^1)^1 A_2^2 \left(\bar{\zeta} \left(-2b_1 \frac{s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})}{r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})} + c_1 \left(\frac{s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})}{r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})} \right)^2 \right) + c_2 \left(\frac{s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})}{r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})} \right)^2 \right) \\ &= (\bar{A}_1^1)^2 A_2^2 \frac{s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})}{(r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}))^2} ((c_2 + \bar{\zeta}c_1)s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - 2b_1\bar{\zeta}r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})) \\ &= -2b_1\bar{\zeta}(\bar{A}_1^1)^2 A_2^2 \frac{s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})}{(r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}))^2} (r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) + \zeta s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})). \end{aligned}$$

Also, as in (7.2.6), we have

$$(7.3.3) \quad \bar{A}_1^1 \bar{A}_2^2 - \bar{A}_1^2 \bar{A}_2^1 = \frac{\bar{A}_1^1 \bar{A}_2^2}{r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})} (r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) + \zeta s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})).$$

It follows that the only way to obtain $a'_2 = 0$, via a biholomorphic transformation of the form considered here, is to choose $\zeta = 0$, i.e. $A_2^1 = 0$. This in turn forces $A_1^2 = 0$, since $s(0, 0) = 0$. Moreover, $A_1^2 = 0$ implies $a'_1 = 0$. We are left with the following equations

$$(7.3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} b'_1 &= |A_1^1|^2 \bar{A}_2^2 b_1 \\ c'_1 &= A_1^1 (\bar{A}_2^2)^2 c_1 \\ c'_2 &= |A_2^2|^2 \bar{A}_2^2 c_2. \end{aligned}$$

We may choose $\bar{A}_1^1$ and $\bar{A}_2^2$ such that $b'_1 = -i$ and $c'_1 = -2i$. In doing so, we obtain $c'_2 = -2i\lambda$, where $\lambda = 2\bar{b}_1 c_2 / |c_1|^2$. Thus, M is equivalent to (A.ii.3), where $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $\lambda \neq 0$, is uniquely determined by b_1 , c_1 , and c_2 . This completes the proof of Theorem A (ii) in the case $\Delta_{ab} = \Delta_{ac} = 0$.

7.4. The case $\Delta_{ab} = \Delta_{bc} = 0$. In this case, we have $\Delta_{ac} \neq 0$ and $(b_1, b_2) = (0, 0)$. The following shows that M is not equivalent to any of the forms (A.ii.1-3).

Assertion 7.4.1. *If $b_1 = b_2 = 0$ and $\Delta_{ac} = a_1 c_2 - a_2 c_1 \neq 0$ then, after any biholomorphic transformation (6.9) satisfying (7.1.9), $(a'_1, a'_2) \neq (0, 0)$ and $(c'_1, c'_2) \neq (0, 0)$.*

Proof. We begin by assuming that $a_1 c_2 \neq 0$. First, let us set $\bar{A}_2^2 = 0$. In order to satisfy (7.1.9) and still have a biholomorphic transformation, we must make $\bar{A}_1^1 = 0$. It is then easy to check that $a'_1 c'_2 \neq 0$.

Next, let us assume $\bar{A}_2^2 \neq 0$ and make $R(A_2^1, \bar{A}_2^1, A_2^2, \bar{A}_2^2) = 0$ by choosing A_2^1, A_2^2 such that

$$(7.4.2) \quad c_1 A_2^1 + c_2 A_2^2 = 0.$$

In order to satisfy (7.1.9) and still have a biholomorphic transformation, we must have $\bar{A}_1^1 = 0$, because $\bar{A}_2^2 \neq 0$, $a_1 c_2 - a_2 c_1 \neq 0$, and (7.4.2) imply that $a_1 A_2^1 + a_2 A_2^2 \neq 0$ and $\bar{A}_2^2 \neq 0$. Such a transformation yields $a'_1 \neq 0$, as is easy to verify. Solving for A_2^2 in (7.4.2) and substituting in the expression for c'_2 , we obtain

$$(7.4.3) \quad c'_2 = \frac{A_2^1 (\bar{A}_2^1)^2}{c_2} (a_1 c_2 - a_2 c_1),$$

which cannot be made to vanish when $\bar{A}_1^1 = 0$ since the latter implies that $\bar{A}_2^1 \neq 0$.

Thirdly, let us consider the situation where $R(A_2^1, \bar{A}_2^1, A_2^2, \bar{A}_2^2) \neq 0$ and the equation (7.1.9) is satisfied by choosing $\bar{A}_1^1$ according to (7.1.12). Setting $\bar{A}_2^1 = \zeta \bar{A}_2^2$ and substituting (7.1.12) in the equation for a'_2 we obtain

$$(7.4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} a'_2 &= A_2^2 (\bar{A}_1^1)^2 \left(\bar{\zeta} \left(a_1 + c_1 \left(\frac{s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})}{r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})} \right)^2 \right) + a_2 + c_2 \left(\frac{s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})}{r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})} \right)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{A_2^2 (\bar{A}_1^1)^2}{(\zeta \bar{\zeta})^2} (c_1 \bar{\zeta} + c_2) (a_1 \bar{\zeta} + a_2) (r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) + \zeta s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})). \end{aligned}$$

As we have seen above, it is not possible to make $r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) + \zeta s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = 0$ by a biholomorphic transformation (see the proofs of Assertion 7.2.1 and 7.3.1). Moreover, $r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ must be different from 0, which is equivalent to $c_1\bar{\zeta} + c_2 \neq 0$. Hence, to make $a'_2 = 0$ we must make $a_1\bar{\zeta} + a_2 = 0$. This in turn implies that $s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = 0$. Substituting this in the equation for a'_1 , we obtain $a'_1 = A_1^1(\bar{A}_1^1)^2 a_1$. The latter cannot be made 0 by a biholomorphic transformation. Thus, we cannot make both $a'_1 = 0$ and $a'_2 = 0$. A similar argument shows that we cannot make both $c'_1 = 0$ and $c'_2 = 0$. This concludes the proof of Assertion 7.4.1 under the additional assumption that $a_1 c_2 \neq 0$. If $a_1 c_2 = 0$, then $a_2 c_1 \neq 0$. The proof in this case is similar to the one above and left to the reader. $\square$

Now, to transform M into one of the forms (A.ii.4) or (A.ii.5) we need to make $b'_1 = 0$, in addition to satisfying (7.1.9). We claim that this implies that the only possible biholomorphic transformations have either $A_1^1 = A_2^2 = 0$ or $A_2^1 = A_1^2 = 0$. We shall prove it in the case $a_1 = c_2 = 0$. The remaining cases are similar and left to the reader. Thus, assume $a_1 = c_2 = 0$ which, in turn, implies $a_2 c_1 \neq 0$. Then, (7.1.9) can be satisfied in three ways, either $\bar{A}_2^2 = 0$, $\bar{A}_2^1 = 0$, or (7.1.12) holds. If $\bar{A}_2^2 = 0$, then we need to choose $\bar{A}_1^1 = 0$ in order to make $b'_1 = 0$. If $\bar{A}_2^1 = 0$, then we need $\bar{A}_1^2 = 0$ to make $b'_1 = 0$. If we choose $\bar{A}_1^2$ according to (7.1.12), assuming then that $R(A_2^1, \bar{A}_2^1, A_2^2, \bar{A}_2^2) \neq 0$, then b'_1 is given by (7.1.13). This cannot be made 0 via a biholomorphic transformation, as is easy to verify, since $R(A_2^1, \bar{A}_2^1, A_2^2, \bar{A}_2^2) \neq 0$ implies $A_2^1 A_2^2 \neq 0$ and $\bar{A}_1^1 = 0$ would imply $\bar{A}_1^2 = 0$ which is not possible for a biholomorphic transformation. This proves the claim above.

Now, any transformation with $A_1^1 = A_2^2 = 0$ or $A_2^1 = A_1^2 = 0$ satisfies (7.1.9) and makes $b'_1 = 0$. Moreover, for a transformation with $A_1^1 = A_2^2 = 0$ we obtain

$$(7.4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} a'_1 &= c_2 A_1^2 (\bar{A}_1^2)^2, & a'_2 &= c_1 A_2^1 (\bar{A}_1^2)^2 \\ c'_1 &= a_2 A_1^2 (\bar{A}_2^1)^2, & c'_2 &= a_1 A_2^1 (\bar{A}_2^1)^2, \end{aligned}$$

whereas for a transformation with $A_2^1 = A_1^2 = 0$, we obtain

$$(7.4.6) \quad \begin{aligned} a'_1 &= a_1 A_1^1 (\bar{A}_1^1)^2, & a'_2 &= a_2 A_2^2 (\bar{A}_1^1)^2 \\ c'_1 &= c_1 A_1^1 (\bar{A}_2^2)^2, & c'_2 &= c_2 A_2^2 (\bar{A}_2^2)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in both cases $a'_1 c'_2$ and $a'_2 c'_1$ differ from $a_1 c_2$ and $a_2 c_1$, respectively, by a non-zero constant. Thus, the properties $a_1 c_2 \neq 0$ and $a_2 c_1 \neq 0$ are invariant.

Suppose first that $a_2 c_1 \neq 0$ and $a_1 c_2 = 0$. Since $a_1 c_2 = 0$ and this property is invariant, M is not equivalent to (A.ii.4) for any choices of $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{C}$. On the other hand, by choosing the appropriate transformation, either $A_1^1 = A_2^2 = 0$ or $A_2^1 = A_1^2 = 0$, and the non-zero coefficients suitably, we can make $c'_2 = 0$, $a_2 = c_1 = -2i$. This makes $a_1 = -2i\eta$, where $\eta \in \mathbb{C}$ is uniquely determined by a_1 , a_2 , c_1 , and c_2 . This proves that M is equivalent to (A.ii.5) for precisely one $\eta \in \mathbb{C}$.

Suppose next that $a_1 c_2 \neq 0$. Then M is not equivalent to (A.ii.5) for any $\eta \in \mathbb{C}$. On the other hand, by choosing $A_2^1 = A_1^2 = 0$ and A_1^1, A_2^2 appropriately, we can make $a'_1 = c'_2 = -2i$. This makes $a_2 = -2i\alpha$ and $c_1 = -2i\beta$, where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ are completely determined by a_1 , a_2 , c_1 , and c_2 . Since $a'_1 c'_2 - a'_2 c'_1 \neq 0$, it is easy to see that $\alpha\beta \neq 1$.

However, in this case we could also choose the other type of transformation, $A_1^1 = A_2^2 = 0$. By choosing A_1^1, A_2^2 appropriately, we can make $a'_1 = c'_2 = -2i$.

As is easy to verify, this makes $a_2 = -2i\beta$ and $c_1 = -2i\alpha$, where α and β are the same numbers as above. Thus, M can be transformed to (A.ii.4) for precisely two choices of the pair (μ, ν) , with $\mu\nu \neq 1$, namely (α, β) and (β, α) . We can make the choice unique by requiring, e.g., that $|\mu| \geq |\nu|$ and $\arg \mu \geq \arg \nu$, where $\arg \mu, \arg \nu \in [0, 2\pi)$, if $|\mu| = |\nu|$. This completes the proof of Theorem A (ii) in the case $\Delta_{ab} = \Delta_{bc} = 0$.

8. PROOF OF THEOREM A (ii); THE CONCLUSION

8.1. Two simple lemmas. We shall keep the notation established in the preceding sections. We start by stating two simple, but useful lemmas. Their validity is easy to check and the details are left to the reader.

Lemma 8.1.1. *The following identity holds*

$$(8.1.2) \quad p_1(\zeta) = (a_1\zeta + b_1)r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - (b_1\zeta + c_1)s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}).$$

Lemma 8.1.3. *If ζ_0 is a root of $p_1(\zeta)$ such that $r(\zeta_0, \bar{\zeta}_0) \neq 0$ then, with $\bar{A}_1^2$ chosen according to (7.1.12) and $\bar{A}_2^1 = \zeta_0 \bar{A}_2^2$, the following holds*

$$(8.1.4) \quad \bar{A}_1^1 \bar{A}_2^2 - \bar{A}_2^1 \bar{A}_1^2 = \frac{\bar{A}_1^1 \bar{A}_2^2}{b_1 \zeta_0 + c_1} (a_1 \zeta_0^2 + 2b_1 \zeta_0 + c_1).$$

We now proceed with the proof of Theorem A.

8.2. The case $\Delta_{ac} = 0$ and $\Delta_{ab}\Delta_{bc} \neq 0$. Since $b_2 = 0$, it follows that $a_2 b_1$ and $b_1 c_2$ are both non-zero. We shall make a biholomorphic transformation such that $b'_1 = b'_2 = 0$. This will complete the proof in this case, because the transformed hypersurface M' was treated in section 7.4 above. We set

$$(8.2.1) \quad \bar{A}_2^1 = \zeta \bar{A}_2^2.$$

Equation (7.1.9), which is equivalent to $b'_2 = 0$, becomes

$$(8.2.2) \quad \bar{A}_1^2 r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) + \bar{A}_1^1 s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = 0.$$

If $r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = 0$ and $s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = 0$ have a common solution ζ_0 , then (8.2.2) can be satisfied by choosing $\zeta = \zeta_0$. If they do not, then we satisfy (8.2.2) by

$$(8.2.3) \quad \bar{A}_1^2 = -\bar{A}_1^1 \frac{s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})}{r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})},$$

where ζ is any complex number such that $r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) \neq 0$. (Equation (8.2.3) is just (7.1.12) with $\bar{A}_2^1 = \zeta \bar{A}_2^2$). Substituting (8.2.3) in $b'_1 = 0$, we obtain (7.1.18). Note that in this case

$$(8.2.4) \quad p_1(\zeta) = b_1(-a_2 \zeta^2 + c_2)$$

and, hence, $p_1(\zeta)$ has two distinct roots

$$(8.2.5) \quad \zeta_1 = \sqrt{\frac{c_2}{a_2}}, \quad \zeta_2 = -\sqrt{\frac{c_2}{a_2}}.$$

Suppose first that one of those roots, say ζ_1 (the other case being similar), is not a solution of

$$(8.2.6) \quad r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = 0.$$

Then we can make $b'_1 = b'_2 = 0$ by choosing $\bar{A}_2^1$ and $\bar{A}_1^2$ according to (8.2.1) and (8.2.3), respectively, and setting $\zeta = \zeta_1$. We just need to check that this transformation is biholomorphic. In view of Lemma 8.1.3, it suffices to check that

$$(8.2.7) \quad a_1\zeta_1^2 + 2b_1\zeta_1 + c_1 \neq 0.$$

Using (8.2.5) and the fact that $a_2c_1 = a_1c_2$, we obtain

$$(8.2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} a_1\zeta_1^2 + 2b_1\zeta_1 + c_1 &= c_1 \left(\frac{a_2}{c_2}\zeta_1^2 + 1 \right) + 2b_1\zeta_1 \\ &= 2(c_1 + b_1\zeta_1). \end{aligned}$$

Since ζ_1 is assumed not to be a solution of (8.2.6), it follows from (8.1.2) that either (8.2.7) holds, in which case we are done, or ζ_1 is a root of both $b_1\zeta + c_1$ and $a_1\zeta + b_1$, i.e.

$$(8.2.9) \quad \frac{c_1}{b_1} = \frac{b_1}{a_1}$$

or equivalently

$$(8.2.10) \quad b_1^2 - a_1c_1 = 0.$$

If ζ_2 is also not a solution of (8.2.6) then we could have chosen $\zeta = \zeta_2$ instead of $\zeta = \zeta_1$ and we would be done, since at most one of the points ζ_1, ζ_2 can be a root of $c_1 + b_1\zeta$. Thus, we are left with the situation where (8.2.10) holds, and where one of the roots ζ_1, ζ_2 is also a solution of (8.2.6). The identity (8.2.10) implies that

$$(8.2.11) \quad \zeta_1 = -\frac{c_1}{b_1} = -\frac{b_1}{a_1} \quad , \quad \zeta_2 = \frac{c_1}{b_1} = \frac{b_1}{a_1}.$$

A simple computation shows that

$$(8.2.12) \quad r(\zeta_1, \bar{\zeta}_1) = c_2 \quad , \quad s(\zeta_1, \bar{\zeta}_1) = -\frac{a_2b_1}{a_1},$$

so the root which is also a solution of (8.2.6) can only be ζ_2 . It follows from Lemma 8.1.1 that $s(\zeta_2, \bar{\zeta}_2) = 0$. We can then satisfy (8.2.2) by choosing $\bar{A}_2^1 = \zeta_2\bar{A}_2^2$. Setting

$$(8.2.13) \quad \bar{A}_1^1 = t\bar{A}_1^2$$

and substituting in the equation for b'_1 , we obtain

$$(8.2.14) \quad \begin{aligned} b'_1 &= A_1^2\bar{A}_2^2(\bar{t}(a_1\zeta_2 + t + b_1(t + \zeta_2) + c_1) + a_2t\zeta_2 + c_2) \\ &= A_1^2\bar{A}_2^2(\zeta_2(a_1|t|^2 + b_1\bar{t} + a_2t) + b_1|t|^2 + c_1\bar{t} + c_2) \\ &\quad + A_1^2\bar{A}_2^2(r(t, \bar{t}) + \zeta_2s(t, \bar{t})) \end{aligned}$$

We claim that $b'_1 = 0$ if $t = -c_1/b_1$. To see this, we substitute this value for t in (8.2.14) and use (8.2.11) and (8.2.12) to find

$$(8.2.15) \quad \begin{aligned} b'_1 &= A_1^2 \bar{A}_2^2 \left(c_2 - \frac{c_1}{b_1} \frac{a_2 b_1}{a_1} \right) \\ &= A_1^2 \bar{A}_2^2 \frac{1}{a_1} (a_1 c_2 - a_2 c_1), \end{aligned}$$

and $a_1 c_2 - a_2 c_1 = 0$ by assumption.

Next suppose that both roots of $p_1(\zeta)$ solve (8.2.6). In view of (8.2.12) above, we observe that (8.2.6) and

$$(8.2.16) \quad b_1 \zeta + c_1 = 0$$

have no common solutions. Thus, it follows from Lemma 8.1.1 that both roots of $p_1(\zeta)$ are common solutions of (8.2.6) and

$$(8.2.17) \quad s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) = 0.$$

We may then satisfy (8.2.2) by choosing e.g. $\bar{A}_2^1 = \zeta_1 \bar{A}_2^2$. If we substitute this and (8.2.13) in the equation for b'_1 , we obtain

$$(8.2.18) \quad b'_1 = A_1^2 \bar{A}_2^2 (r(t, \bar{t}) + \zeta_1 s(t, \bar{t})).$$

Choosing $t = \zeta_2$, we obtain $b'_1 = 0$. We need to check that the corresponding transformation is biholomorphic. This is clear because

$$(8.2.19) \quad \bar{A}_1^1 \bar{A}_2^2 - \bar{A}_2^1 \bar{A}_1^2 = \bar{A}_1^2 \bar{A}_2^2 (\zeta_2 - \zeta_1)$$

and $\zeta_2 \neq \zeta_1$. This completes the proof in the case where $\Delta_{ac} = 0$ and $\Delta_{ab} \Delta_{bc} \neq 0$.

8.3. The case $\Delta_{ab} = 0$ and $\Delta_{ac} \Delta_{bc} \neq 0$. As above, it suffices to make a biholomorphic transformation such that $b'_1 = b'_2 = 0$. Now, it follows from the assumptions that $a_2 = 0$ and $a_1 b_1 c_2 \neq 0$. We leave it to the reader to verify that a transformation (6.9) with $\bar{A}_2^2 = 0$ and $\bar{A}_1^2 = -\bar{A}_1^1 a_1 / b_1$ makes $b'_1 = b'_2 = 0$. The parameter $\bar{A}_2^1$ can be chosen arbitrarily and the transformation is biholomorphic as long as $\bar{A}_1^1 \bar{A}_2^1 \neq 0$.

8.4. The case $\Delta_{bc} = 0$ and $\Delta_{ab} \Delta_{ac} \neq 0$. We shall make a biholomorphic transformation such that $b'_1 = b'_2 = 0$. As above, it follows from the assumptions that $c_2 = 0$ and $a_2 b_1 c_1 \neq 0$. It is easy to verify that a transformation (6.9) with $\bar{A}_1^1 = 0$ and $\bar{A}_2^1 = -\bar{A}_2^2 c_1 / b_1$ makes $b'_1 = b'_2 = 0$. Such a transformation is biholomorphic as long as $\bar{A}_1^2 \bar{A}_2^2 \neq 0$.

8.5. Last case; $\Delta_{ab} \Delta_{ac} \Delta_{bc} \neq 0$. We have $a_2 b_1 c_2 \neq 0$ and at least one of c_1, a_1 is non-zero. This time it suffices to make a biholomorphic transformation (6.9), satisfying (7.1.9), such that the transformed hypersurface M' falls into one of the six categories considered in sections 7.2–7.4 and 8.2–8.4. Thus, it suffices to make $b'_1 = 0, a'_2 = 0, c'_2 = 0$, or $(a_1, c_1) = (0, 0)$.

First, let us assume that one root ζ_0 of $p_1(\zeta)$ is also a solution of (8.2.6). Since $c_1 \neq 0$, equation (8.2.13) and Lemma 8.1.1 imply that ζ_0 is a solution of (8.2.17) as

well. Thus, (8.2.6) and (8.2.17) have a common solution ζ_0 . As above, this means that we may satisfy (7.1.9) by choosing $\bar{A}_2^1 = \zeta_0 \bar{A}_2^2$, without making any choices of $\bar{A}_1^1$ and $\bar{A}_1^2$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned}
 c'_2 &= A_2^2(\bar{A}_2^2)^2(\bar{\zeta}_0(a_1\zeta_0^2 + 2b_1\zeta_0 + c_1) + a_2\zeta_0^2 + c_2) \\
 (8.5.1) \quad &= A_2^2(\bar{A}_2^2)^2(r(\zeta_0, \bar{\zeta}_0) + \zeta_0 s(\zeta_0, \bar{\zeta}_0)) \\
 &= 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we are left with the situation where no root of $p_1(\zeta)$ solves (8.2.6). Let us denote the roots by ζ_1, ζ_2 , and observe that these two roots need not be distinct. Assume first that they are, i.e. $\zeta_1 \neq \zeta_2$. We satisfy (7.1.9) by setting $\bar{A}_2^1 = \zeta \bar{A}_2^2$ and choosing $\bar{A}_1^2$ according to (8.2.3). The equation for b'_1 becomes (7.1.18), and we can make $b'_1 = 0$ by choosing either $\zeta = \zeta_1$ or $\zeta = \zeta_2$. We have to check that one of these choices makes the transformation biholomorphic. By Lemma 8.1.3, this is equivalent to at least one of the roots ζ_1, ζ_2 not being a root of

$$(8.5.2) \quad p_2(\zeta) = a_1\zeta^2 + 2b_1\zeta + c_1.$$

By comparing the coefficients of $p_1(\zeta)$ and $p_2(\zeta)$, we find that $p_1(\zeta)$ and $p_2(\zeta)$ have the same set of roots if and only if

$$(8.5.3) \quad \begin{cases} b_1^2 - a_1c_1 = 0 \\ a_1c_2 + a_2c_1 = 0. \end{cases}$$

However, the first equation of (8.5.3) is also equivalent to $p_2(\zeta)$ having a double root. Since we assumed $\zeta_1 \neq \zeta_2$, it follows that both of these cannot be roots of $p_2(\zeta)$.

Next, assume that $p_1(\zeta)$ has a double root. A straightforward calculation shows that this happens if and only if

$$(8.5.5) \quad (a_1c_2 - a_2c_2)^2 + 4a_2c_2b_1^2 = 0,$$

or equivalently,

$$(8.5.6) \quad (a_1c_2 + a_2c_1)^2 + 4a_2c_2(b_1^2 - a_1c_1) = 0.$$

The double root is then

$$(8.5.7) \quad \zeta_0 = \frac{a_1c_2 - a_2c_2}{2a_2b_1}.$$

Now, (8.5.5) implies that ζ_0 is also a root of $p_2(\zeta)$. Thus, the transformation corresponding to the choice $\zeta = \zeta_0$ is not biholomorphic. It follows that we cannot make $b'_1 = 0$. However, we can make $a'_2 = 0$ as follows.

Assume first that $b_1^2 - a_1c_1 = 0$, i.e. that $p_2(\zeta)$ also has a double root at ζ_0 . Then a straightforward calculation shows that the transformation corresponding to $\bar{A}_2^2 = 0, \bar{A}_2^1 = \zeta_0 \bar{A}_1^2, \bar{A}_1^1 = b_1$ and $\bar{A}_1^2 = 0$ arbitrary yields $c'_2 = 0$.

Next, assume that $b_1^2 - a_1c_1 \neq 0$. Equation (8.5.6) implies then that $a_1c_2 + a_2c_1 \neq 0$. The equation for a'_2 becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 (8.5.8) \quad a'_2 &= A_2^2(\bar{A}_1^1)^2 \left(\bar{\zeta} \left(a_1 - 2b_1 \frac{s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})}{r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})} + c_1 \left(\frac{s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})}{r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})} \right)^2 \right) + a_2 + c_2 \left(\frac{s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})}{r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})} \right)^2 \right) \\
 &= \frac{A_2^2(\bar{A}_1^1)^2}{r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})^2} ((a_1\bar{\zeta} + a_2)r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})^2 - 2b_1\bar{\zeta}r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) + (c_1\bar{\zeta} + c_2)s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})^2) \\
 &= \frac{A_2^2(\bar{A}_1^1)^2}{r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})^2} \cdot \\
 &\quad \left((c_1\bar{\zeta} + c_2) \left(s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \frac{b_1\bar{\zeta}r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})}{c_1\bar{\zeta} + c_2} \right)^2 + \left(a_1\bar{\zeta} + a_2 - \frac{b_1^2\bar{\zeta}^2}{c_1\bar{\zeta} + c_2} \right) r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})^2 \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

Now, we solve for b_1^2 in (8.5.5) and obtain the following

$$\begin{aligned}
 (8.5.9) \quad a_1\bar{\zeta} + a_2 - \frac{b_1^2\bar{\zeta}^2}{c_1\bar{\zeta} + c_2} &= a_1\bar{\zeta} + a_2 + \frac{(a_1c_2 - a_2c_1)^2}{4a_2c_2(c_1\bar{\zeta} + c_2)}\bar{\zeta}^2 \\
 &= \frac{4a_2c_2(a_1\bar{\zeta} + a_2)(c_1\bar{\zeta} + c_2) + (a_1c_2 - a_2c_1)^2\bar{\zeta}^2}{4a_2c_2(c_1\bar{\zeta} + c_2)} \\
 &= \frac{(a_1c_2 - a_2c_1)^2\bar{\zeta}^2 + 4a_2c_2(a_1c_2 + a_2c_1)\bar{\zeta} + 4a_2^2c_2^2}{4a_2c_2(c_1\bar{\zeta} + c_2)} \\
 &= \frac{((a_1c_2 + a_2c_1)\bar{\zeta} + 2a_2c_2)^2}{4a_2c_2(c_1\bar{\zeta} + c_2)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, using (7.1.16) and (8.5.6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (8.5.10) \quad s(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) - \frac{b_1\bar{\zeta}}{c_1\bar{\zeta} + c_2}r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}) &= a_1|\zeta|^2 + b_1\bar{\zeta} + a_2\zeta - \frac{b_1\bar{\zeta}}{c_1\bar{\zeta} + c_2}(b_1|\zeta|^2 + c_1\bar{\zeta} + c_2) \\
 &= \frac{(a_1c_1 - b_1^2)\bar{\zeta}|\zeta|^2 + (a_1c_2 + a_2c_1)|\zeta|^2 + a_2c_2\zeta}{c_1\bar{\zeta} + c_2} \\
 &= \frac{\zeta}{c_1\bar{\zeta} + c_2} \left(\frac{(a_1c_2 + a_2c_1)^2}{4a_2c_2}\bar{\zeta}^2 + (a_1c_2 + a_2c_2)\bar{\zeta} + a_2c_2 \right) \\
 &= \frac{\zeta}{4a_2c_2(c_1\bar{\zeta} + c_2)} ((a_1c_2 + a_2c_1)\bar{\zeta} + 2a_2c_2)^2.
 \end{aligned}$$

If we combine (8.5.9) and (8.5.10), then we get

$$(8.5.11) \quad a'_2 = \frac{A_2^2(\bar{A}_1^1)^2((a_1c_2 + a_2c_1)\bar{\zeta} + 2a_2c_2)^2}{4a_2c_2(c_1\bar{\zeta} + c_2)r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})^2} \left(\frac{\zeta^2((a_1c_2 + a_2c_1)\bar{\zeta} + 2a_2c_2)^2}{4a_2c_2} + r(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})^2 \right).$$

Consequently, if ζ_1 is the solution of

$$(8.5.12) \quad (a_1c_2 + a_2c_1)\bar{\zeta} + 2a_2c_2 = 0,$$

and ζ_1 is not a solution of $c_1\bar{\zeta} + c_2 = 0$ or (8.2.6), then the transformation that corresponds to the choice $\zeta = \zeta_1$ makes $a'_2 = 0$. The first condition is easy to check,

$$(8.5.13) \quad c_1\bar{\zeta}_1 + c_2 = c_2 \frac{a_1c_2 - a_1c_2}{c_2} \neq 0$$

Furthermore, ζ_1 cannot be a solution of (8.2.6), in view of (8.5.10). If it were, then ζ_1 would also be a solution of (8.2.17). Lemma 8.1.1, in turn, would then imply that ζ_1 is a root of $p_1(\zeta)$. This is not possible, since we assumed that no root of $p_1(\zeta)$ solves (8.2.6).

In order to conclude the proof of Theorem A (ii), we need to check that the transformation corresponding to $\zeta = \zeta_1$ is biholomorphic. A simple computation, using (8.5.10), shows that

$$(8.5.14) \quad \bar{A}_1^1 \bar{A}_2^2 - \bar{A}_2^1 \bar{A}_1^2 = \bar{A}_1^1 \bar{A}_2^2 \frac{r(\zeta_1, \bar{\zeta}_1)^2}{c_1 \bar{\zeta}_1 + c_2} \neq 0.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem A.

9. PROOF OF THEOREM B

9.1. The setup. Following [CM], we shall reduce the proof to a problem of describing the kernel and range of a certain linear operator. We assume that M is a hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^3$ of the form (A.i.k), where k is 1, 2, or 3. We write the defining equation of M at 0 as in (3.14). We subject M to a formal transformation

$$(9.1.1) \quad z' = \tilde{f}(z, w) \quad , \quad w' = \tilde{g}(z, w),$$

where $\tilde{f} = (\tilde{f}^1, \tilde{f}^2)$, that preserves the form of M modulo terms of weighted degree at least 4, i.e. the transformed hypersurface M' is given by a defining equation of the form

$$(9.1.2) \quad \text{Im } w' = |z'_1|^2 + p_3(z', \bar{z}') + F'(z', \bar{z}', \text{Re } w'),$$

where $F'(z', \bar{z}', s')$ contains terms of weighted degree greater than or equal to 4. We also require that the new coordinates are regular for M' , i.e. that

$$(9.1.3) \quad \tilde{g}(z, w) = Q' \left(\tilde{f}(z, w), \bar{\tilde{f}}(0, w), \bar{\tilde{g}}(0, w) \right),$$

where $w' = Q'(z', \bar{z}', \bar{w}')$ is a complex defining equation of M' at 0 as in §5. Thus, $\tilde{f}$ and $\tilde{g}$ are subjected to the restrictions imposed by Proposition 3.3. As mentioned in §3, the most general transformation of this kind can be factored uniquely as

$$(9.1.4) \quad (\tilde{f}(z, w), \tilde{g}(z, w)) = (T \circ P)(z, w),$$

where P and T are as described in §3.

To prove Theorem B, it suffices to prove that there is a unique transformation

$$(9.1.5) \quad T(z, w) = (\hat{f}(z, w), \hat{g}(z, w)) = (z + f(z, w), w + g(z, w))$$

to normal form (i.e. such that the transformed hypersurface M' is defined by (9.1.2) with $F' \in \mathcal{N}^k$ for $k = 1, 2, 3$ accordingly) such that $f = (f^1, f^2)$, f^1 is $O(3)$, f^2 is $O(2)$, g is $O(4)$, and such that the following additional conditions are satisfied. If $(M, 0)$ is of the form (A.i.1) or (A.i.3), then the constant terms in the following formal series vanish

$$(9.1.6) \quad \frac{\partial^2 f^2}{\partial z_1^2}, \text{Re } \frac{\partial^2 f^1}{\partial z_1^2}, \frac{\partial^3 f^1}{\partial z_1^3}.$$

If $(M, 0)$ is of the form (A.i.2), then the constant terms in the following series vanish

$$(9.1.7) \quad \begin{cases} \frac{\partial^2 f^j}{\partial z_k \partial w}, \frac{\partial^3 f^1}{\partial z^\beta}, \frac{\partial^3 f^1}{\partial z^\alpha \partial w}, \frac{\partial^3 f^j}{\partial z_k \partial w^2} \\ \frac{\partial^4 f^1}{\partial z^\beta \partial w}, \operatorname{Re} \frac{\partial^4 f^1}{\partial z_1 \partial w^3}. \end{cases}$$

We decompose (f^1, f^2, g) , F , and F' into weighted homogeneous parts as follows

$$\begin{aligned} f^1(z, w) &= \sum_{\nu=3}^{\infty} f_{\nu}^1(z, w) \quad , \quad f^2(z, w) = \sum_{\nu=2}^{\infty} f_{\nu}^2(z, w) \quad , \quad g(z, w) = \sum_{\nu=4}^{\infty} g_{\nu}(z, w) \\ F(z, \bar{z}, s) &= \sum_{\nu=4}^{\infty} F_{\nu}(z, \bar{z}, s) \quad , \quad F'(z, \bar{z}, s) = \sum_{\nu=4}^{\infty} F'_{\nu}(z, \bar{z}, s). \end{aligned}$$

Recall here that z and $\bar{z}$ are assigned the weight one, w and s are assigned the weight two, and we say that e.g. $F_{\nu}(z, \bar{z}, s)$ is weighted homogeneous of degree ν if for all $t > 0$

$$F_{\nu}(tz, t\bar{z}, t^2s) = t^{\nu} F_{\nu}(z, \bar{z}, s).$$

The formal power series $F, F' \in \mathcal{F}$ (recall, from §3, the notation $\mathcal{F}$ for the space of real power series with terms of weighted degree at least 4) are related as follows

$$(9.1.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im} \hat{g}(z, s + i\phi) &\equiv |\hat{f}^1(z, s + i\phi)|^2 + p_3(\hat{f}(z, s + i\phi), \overline{\hat{f}}(\bar{z}, s - i\phi)) \\ &\quad + F(\hat{f}(z, s + i\phi), \overline{\hat{f}}(\bar{z}, s - i\phi), \operatorname{Re} \hat{g}(z, s + i\phi)), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$(9.1.9) \quad \phi = \phi(z, \bar{z}, s) = |z_1|^2 + p_3(z, \bar{z}) + F(z, \bar{z}, s).$$

Identifying terms of weighted degree $\nu \geq 4$ we obtain

$$(9.1.10) \quad F_{\nu} + \operatorname{Im} g_{\nu} \equiv z_1 \overline{f_{\nu-1}^1} + \bar{z}_1 f_{\nu-1}^1 + p_{3,z_2} f_{\nu-2}^2 + p_{3,\bar{z}_2} \overline{f_{\nu-2}^2} + F'_{\nu} + \dots,$$

where

$$(9.1.11) \quad \begin{aligned} F_{\nu} &= F_{\nu}(z, \bar{z}, s) \quad , \quad F'_{\nu} = F'_{\nu}(z, \bar{z}, s + i|z_1|^2) \\ p_{3,z_2} &= p_{3,z_2}(z, \bar{z}) = \frac{\partial p_3}{\partial z_3}(z, \bar{z}) \end{aligned}$$

$$(9.1.12) \quad \overline{f_{\nu-1}^1} = \overline{f_{\nu-1}^1}(\bar{z}, s - i|z_1|^2) \quad , \quad f_{\nu-1}^1 = f_{\nu-1}^1(z, s + i|z_1|^2) \quad , \quad \text{etc},$$

and where the dots $\dots$ signify terms that only involve F_{μ} , F'_{μ} , g_{μ} , $f_{\mu-1}^1$, and $f_{\mu-2}^2$ for $\mu < \nu$. Noting that

$$(9.1.13) \quad p_{3,\bar{z}_2}(z, \bar{z}) = \overline{p_{3,z_2}(z, \bar{z})}$$

we can write this as

$$(9.1.14) \quad \operatorname{Re}(i z_1 + 2 \bar{z}_1 f_{\nu-1}^1 + 2 p_{3,z_2} f_{\nu-2}^2) = F_{\nu} - F'_{\nu} + \dots$$

Let us define the linear operator

$$(9.1.15) \quad L(f^1, f^2, g) = \operatorname{Re} (ig + 2\bar{z}_1 f^1 + 2p_{3,z_2} f^2)|_{(z,s+i|z_1|^2)}$$

from the space $\mathcal{G}$ to the space $\mathcal{F}$, where $\mathcal{G}$ denotes the space of formal power series (in (z, w)) transformations (f^1, f^2, g) such that f^1 is $O(3)$, f^2 is $O(2)$, and g is $O(4)$. Observe that L maps $(f_{\nu-1}^1, f_{\nu-2}^2, g_\nu)$ to a series that is weighted homogeneous of degree ν . We note, as in [CM], that if we could find subspaces

$$(9.1.16) \quad \mathcal{G}_0 \subset \mathcal{G} \quad , \quad \mathcal{N} \subset \mathcal{F}$$

such that, for any $F \in \mathcal{F}$, the equation

$$(9.1.17) \quad L(f^1, f^2, g) = F \quad \text{mod } \mathcal{N}$$

has a unique solution $(f^1, f^2, g) \in \mathcal{G}_0$ then, given any $F' \in \mathcal{F}$, the equation (9.1.14) would allow us to inductively determine the weighted homogeneous parts F_ν of a normal form $F \in \mathcal{N}$ and the weighted homogeneous parts $(f_{\nu-1}^1, f_{\nu-2}^2, g_\nu)$ of the transformation $(f^1, f^2, g) \in \mathcal{G}_0$ to normal form in a unique fashion. (This can also be formulated as saying that $\mathcal{G}_0$ and $\mathcal{N}$ are complementary subspaces of the kernel and range of L , respectively).

Let us therefore define $\mathcal{G}_0^n \subset \mathcal{G}$, for $n = 1, 2, 3$, as those $(f^1, f^2, g) \in \mathcal{G}$ for which the constant terms, in the series (9.1.6) if $n = 1, 2$ or in the series (9.1.7) if $n = 2$, vanish. Combining all that is said above, we find that the proof of Theorem B will be complete if we prove the following.

Lemma 9.1.18. *Suppose the equation (9.1.2) is of the form (A.i.n) for some $n = 1, 2, 3$. Let $\mathcal{G}_0^n \subset \mathcal{G}$ be as described above and $\mathcal{N}^n$ as defined in §3. Then, for any $F \in \mathcal{F}$, the equation*

$$(9.1.19) \quad L(f^1, f^2, g) = F \quad \text{mod } \mathcal{N}^n$$

has a unique solution $(f^1, f^2, g) \in \mathcal{G}_0^n$.

Proof. The proof is based on decomposing the equation (9.1.19) according to type. Recall that a function $G_{kl}(z, \bar{z}, s)$ has type (k, l) if, for any $t_1, t_2 > 0$, the following holds

$$G_{kl}(t_1 z, t_2 \bar{z}, s) = t_1^k t_2^l G_{kl}(z, \bar{z}, s).$$

We decompose $F \in \mathcal{F}$ according to type

$$(9.1.20) \quad F(z, \bar{z}, s) = \sum_{k,l} F_{kl}(z, \bar{z}, s).$$

We also decompose $(f^1, f^2, g) \in \mathcal{G}$ as follows ($j = 1, 2$)

$$(9.1.21) \quad f^j(z, w) = \sum_k f_k^j(z, w) \quad , \quad g(z, w) = \sum_k g_k(z, w),$$

where $f_k^j(z, w)$, $g_k(z, w)$ are homogeneous of degree k in z , e.g.

$$(9.1.22) \quad f_k^j(tz, tw) = t^k f_k^j(z, w) \quad , \quad g_k(tz, tw) = t^k g_k(z, w) \quad , \quad t > 0$$

The reader should observe that this redefines e.g. $g_2(z, w)$ which, previously, denoted the weighted homogeneous part of degree 2 in $g(z, w)$. However, in what follows we shall not need the decomposition into weighted homogeneous terms and, hence, the above notation should cause no confusion; for the remainder of this paper, e.g. $g_2(z, w)$ means the part of $g(z, w)$ which is homogeneous of degree 2 in z , etc. For brevity, we also use the following notation (as in [CM])

$$(9.1.23) \quad f'(z, w) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial w}(z, w), \dots, f^{(m)}(z, w) = \frac{\partial^m f}{\partial w^m}(z, w), \dots$$

We will also use the fact

$$(9.1.24) \quad f(z, s + i|z_1|^2) = f(z, s + iz_1\bar{z}_1) = \sum_m f^{(m)}(z, s) \frac{(iz_1\bar{z}_1)^m}{m!}.$$

We shall identify terms of type (k, l) in (9.1.19). Since the equation is real, it suffices to consider types where $k \geq l$. Also, note that for (k, l) such that $\mathcal{N}_{kl}^n = \mathcal{F}_{kl}$ the equation (9.1.19) is trivially satisfied. (We use the obvious notation; e.g. $\mathcal{F}_{kl}$ are the elements in $\mathcal{F}$ that are of type (k, l) , etc.) We will need to decompose $p_{3,z_2}(z, \bar{z})$ according to type. We use the notation p_{11} for the part of p_{3,z_2} which is of type $(1, 1)$ and p_{02} for the part which is of type $(0, 2)$. Thus,

$$(9.1.25) \quad p_{3,z_2}(z, \bar{z}) = p_{11}(z, \bar{z}) + p_{02}(z, \bar{z}) \quad , \quad p_{3,\bar{z}_2}(z, \bar{z}) = \overline{p_{11}(z, \bar{z})} + \overline{p_{02}(z, \bar{z})}.$$

Here, the cases (A.i.1) and (A.i.3) differ from (A.i.2) in the respect that $p_{11}(z, \bar{z}) \equiv 0$ in the latter case whereas $p_{11}(z, \bar{z}) \not\equiv 0$ in the first two. This fact makes the normal form for (A.i.2) different from the normal forms for (A.i.1) and (A.i.3). The conclusion of the proof will therefore be carried out in two versions, one for (A.i.1), (A.i.3) and one for (A.i.2).

9.2. Conclusion of the proof of Lemma 9.1.18; the cases (A.i.1) and (A.i.3). In what follows, we use the notation

$$(9.2.1) \quad F_{kl} = F_{kl}(z, \bar{z}, s) \quad , \quad g_k = g_k(z, s) \quad , \quad \overline{g_k} = \overline{g_k}(\bar{z}, s) \quad , \quad \text{etc.}$$

Collecting terms of equal type in (9.1.19), we obtain the following decoupled systems of differential equations, for $k \geq 3$,

$$(9.2.2) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{i}{2} g_k = F_{k0} \\ \bar{z}_1 f_{k+1,1}^1 + p_{11} f_k^2 - \frac{z_1 \bar{z}_1}{2} g_k' = F_{k+1,1} \pmod{\mathcal{N}_{k+1,1}^n} \end{array} \right.$$

where $n = 1, 3$ according to whether the type is (A.i.1) or (A.i.3), and

$$(9.2.3) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \overline{p_{02}} \overline{f_0^2} + \frac{i}{2} g_2 = F_{20} \\ \bar{z}_1 f_3^1 + p_{11} f_2^2 - i z_1 \bar{z}_1 \overline{p_{02}} (\overline{f_0^2})' - \frac{z_1 \bar{z}_1}{2} g_2' = F_{31} \mod \mathcal{N}_{31}^n \\ i z_1 \bar{z}_1^2 (f_3^1)' + i z_1 \bar{z}_1 p_{11} (f_2^2)' - \frac{z_1^2 \bar{z}_1^2}{2} \overline{p_{02}} (\overline{f_0^2})'' \\ + p_{02} f_4^2 - \frac{i z_1^2 \bar{z}_1^2}{4} g_2'' = F_{42} \mod \mathcal{N}_{42}^n, \end{array} \right.$$

$$(9.2.4) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} z_1 \overline{f_0^1} + \frac{i}{2} g_1 = F_{10} \\ -i z_1^2 \bar{z}_1 (\overline{f_0^1})' + \bar{z}_1 f_2^1 + p_{11} f_1^2 + \overline{p_{02}} \overline{f_1^2} - \frac{z_1 \bar{z}_1}{2} g_1' = F_{21} \mod \mathcal{N}_{21}^n \\ i z_1 \bar{z}_1^2 (f_2^1)' - \frac{z_1^3 \bar{z}_1^2}{2} (\overline{f_0^1})'' + i z_1 \bar{z}_1 p_{11} (f_1^2)' \\ + p_{02} f_3^2 - i z_1 \bar{z}_1 \overline{p_{02}} (\overline{f_1^2})' - \frac{i z_1^2 \bar{z}_1^2}{4} g_1'' = F_{32} \mod \mathcal{N}_{32}^n \end{array} \right.$$

$$(9.2.5) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -\operatorname{Im} g_0 = F_{00} \\ 2\operatorname{Re} (\bar{z}_1 f_1^1) + 2\operatorname{Re} (p_{11} f_0^2) - z_1 \bar{z}_1 \operatorname{Re} g_0' = F_{11} \mod \mathcal{N}_{11}^m \\ 2z_1 \bar{z}_1 \operatorname{Im} (p_{11} (f_0^2)') - 2\operatorname{Re} (p_{02} f_2^2) \\ - 2z_1 \bar{z}_1 \operatorname{Im} (\bar{z}_1 (f_1^1)') + \frac{z_1^2 \bar{z}_1^2}{2} \operatorname{Im} g_0'' = F_{22} \mod \mathcal{N}_{22}^n \\ -z_1^2 \bar{z}_1^2 \operatorname{Re} (\bar{z}_1 (f_1^1)') - z_1^2 \bar{z}_1^2 \operatorname{Re} (p_{11} (f_0^2)') \\ - 2z_1 \bar{z}_1 \operatorname{Im} (p_{02} (f_2^2)') + \frac{z_1^3 \bar{z}_1^3}{6} \operatorname{Re} g_0''' = F_{33} \mod \mathcal{N}_{33}^n. \end{array} \right.$$

Solving (9.2.2) is easy. Substitute g_k in the second equation

$$(9.2.6) \quad \bar{z}_1 f_{k+1}^1 + p_{11} f_k^2 = F_{k+1,1} + \dots \mod \mathcal{N}_{k+1,1}^n,$$

where $\dots$ signifies known terms whose precise form is not important since we are solving mod $\mathcal{N}_{k+1,1}^n$ (in this case though, $\dots$ is easy to compute). Now, when $n = 1$ we have

$$(9.2.7) \quad p_{11}(z, \bar{z}) = 2z_2 \bar{z}_2$$

and when $n = 3$

$$(9.2.8) \quad p_{11}(z, \bar{z}) = z_1 \bar{z}_2.$$

Thus, in both cases we can find f_{k+1}^1 and f_k^2 uniquely by decomposing the right side as $\bar{z}_1 G + p_{11} f_k^2 + \bar{z}_1 H$. However, since p_{11} also contains a factor z_1 where i

is 1 or 2 according to whether n is 1 or 3, we can only solve (9.2.6) if $\mathcal{N}_{k+1,1}^n$ is a complementary subspace of those $F_{k+1,1} \in \mathcal{F}_{k+1,1}$ that are of the form

$$(9.2.9) \quad F_{k+1,1} = \bar{z}_1 G_{k+1,0} + \bar{z}_2 z_j H_{k0}.$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{N}_{k+1,1}^n$ described in (3.25) is such a subspace. Hence, (9.2.6) can be solved uniquely for f_{k+1}^1 , f_k^2 , and g_k , for all $k \geq 3$.

We proceed to solve (9.2.3). Solve for g_2 in the first equation and substitute the result in the last two. Noting in the third equation that the terms involving $\overline{f_0^2}$ cancel and that the function f_4^2 is known from the previous step, this third equation becomes

$$(9.2.10) \quad iz_1 \bar{z}_1^2 (f_3^1)' + iz_1 \bar{z}_1 p_{11} (f_2^2)' = F_{42} + \dots \mod \mathcal{N}_{42}^n.$$

As above, the fact that p_{11} is divisible by $\bar{z}_2$ implies that (9.2.10) determines uniquely $(f_3^1)'$ and $(f_2^2)'$. Thus, f_3^1 and f_2^2 are uniquely determined given a choice of

$$(9.2.11) \quad f_3^1(z, 0) \quad , \quad f_2^2(z, 0).$$

Since $f_3^1(z, 0)$ and $f_2^2(z, 0)$ denote the parts of $f^1(z, 0)$ and $f^2(z, 0)$ that are homogeneous of degrees 3 and 2, respectively, the choice in (9.2.11) amounts to a choice of constant terms in the series

$$(9.2.12) \quad \frac{\partial^3 f^1}{\partial z^\beta} \quad , \quad \frac{\partial^2 f^2}{\partial z^\alpha},$$

where α ranges over all multi-indices with $|\alpha| = 2$ and β over those with $|\beta| = 3$. Thus, f_3^1 and f_2^2 are uniquely determined by the condition that $(f^1, f^2, g) \in \mathcal{G}_0^n$. In order for (9.2.10) to be satisfied with this choice of f_3^1 and f_2^2 , $\mathcal{N}_{42}^n$ has to be complementary to those $F_{42} \in \mathcal{F}_{42}$ that are of the form described by the left hand side of (9.2.10). It is straightforward to verify that $\mathcal{N}_{42}^n$ described by (3.24) is such. Substitute f_3^1 and f_2^2 so obtained in the second equation. We obtain

$$(9.2.13) \quad iz_1 \bar{z}_1 \overline{p_{02}} (\overline{f_0^2})' = F_{31} + \dots \mod \mathcal{N}_{31}^n.$$

This determines $\overline{f_0^2}$ uniquely since the constant term in the series $\overline{f^2}$ must be 0. Also, it is easy to verify, using the fact that

$$(9.2.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \overline{p_{02}}(\bar{z}, z) &= z_2^2 + \gamma z_1^2 \quad , \quad \text{if } n = 1 \\ \overline{p_{02}}(\bar{z}, z) &= z_1 z_2 \quad , \quad \text{if } n = 3, \end{aligned}$$

that then (9.2.13) is satisfied if $\mathcal{N}_{31}^n$ is defined by (3.22).

Next, we turn to the system (9.2.4). Solve for g_1 in the first equation and substitute into the last two. Then differentiate the second equation, multiply it by $iz_1 \bar{z}_1$, and subtract from the third equation. We obtain, noting that the series f_3^2 was determined from the system (9.2.2),

$$(9.2.15) \quad 2iz_1 \bar{z}_1 \overline{(f_2^2)'} - 2iz_1 \bar{z}_1^2 \overline{(f_1^1)''} = F_{41} + \dots \mod \mathcal{N}_{41}^n$$

Using (9.2.14), we deduce that (9.2.15) uniquely determines f_1^2 , since the constant term in $\partial f^2/\partial z_j$ must be 0 for $j = 1, 2$. Then, the same equation determines f_0^1 uniquely; the constant terms in f^1 and $\partial f^1/\partial w$ must be 0. With f_1^2 and f_0^1 defined this way, (9.2.15) is satisfied if $\mathcal{N}_{32}^n$ is defined by (3.23). Now, substitute the series so obtained back into the second equation and find

$$(9.2.16) \quad \bar{z}_1 f_2^1 = F_{21} + \dots \mod \mathcal{N}_{21}^n.$$

This determines f_2^1 uniquely, and (9.2.16) is satisfied with $\mathcal{N}_{21}^n$ defined by (3.21).

The last step is to solve the system of equations (9.2.5). Substituting the first equation in the third and observing that f_0^2 and f_2^2 have already been determined, we obtain the following

$$(9.2.17) \quad -2z_1 \bar{z}_1 \operatorname{Im} (\bar{z}_1 (f_1^1)') = F_{22} + \dots \mod \mathcal{N}_{22}^n.$$

Now, the series f_1^1 can be written

$$(9.2.18) \quad f_1^1(z, s) = a_1(s)z_1 + a_2(s)z_2$$

and, hence,

$$(9.2.19) \quad \operatorname{Im} (\bar{z}_1 (f_1^1)') = \operatorname{Im} a_1' z_1 \bar{z}_1 + \frac{1}{2i} a_2' z_2 \bar{z}_1 - \frac{1}{2i} \overline{a_2'} z_1 \bar{z}_2.$$

It follows that $\operatorname{Im} a_1$ and a_2 can be uniquely determined from (9.2.17), since the constant terms in $\operatorname{Im} a_1$ and a_2 are 0. Also, the equation (9.2.17) is satisfied if $\mathcal{N}_{22}^n$ is defined as in (3.21). Next, differentiate the second equation of (9.2.5) twice, multiply by $z_1^2 \bar{z}_1^2/6$, and add to the fourth. We obtain

$$(9.2.20) \quad -\frac{2z_1^2 \bar{z}_1^2}{3} \operatorname{Re} (\bar{z}_1 (f_1^1)'') = F_{33} + \dots \mod \mathcal{N}_{33}^n.$$

Using (9.1.18), we can write

$$(9.2.21) \quad \operatorname{Re} (\bar{z}_1 (f_1^1)'') = \operatorname{Re} a_1'' z_1 \bar{z}_1 + \frac{1}{2} a_2'' z_2 \bar{z}_1 + \frac{1}{2} \overline{a_2''} z_1 \bar{z}_2.$$

Hence, (9.2.20) determines $\operatorname{Re} a_1$ uniquely, with a choice of constant term in $\operatorname{Re} a_1'$, and (9.2.20) is then satisfied if $\mathcal{N}_{33}^n$ is as defined as in (3.21). We conclude that f_1^1 is uniquely determined with a choice of constant term in

$$(9.2.22) \quad \operatorname{Re} \frac{\partial^2 f^1}{\partial z_1 \partial w}.$$

Hence, f_1^1 is uniquely determined by the condition $(f^1, f^2, g) \in \mathcal{G}_0^n$. Substituting back into the second equation, we obtain

$$(9.2.23) \quad -z_1 \bar{z}_1 \operatorname{Re} g_0' = F_{11} + \dots \mod \mathcal{N}_{11}^n.$$

We deduce that $\operatorname{Re} g_0$ is uniquely determined, since the constant term in $\operatorname{Re} g_0$ must be 0, and (9.2.23) is satisfied if $\mathcal{N}_{11}^n$ is given by (3.21). This completes the proof of Lemma 9.1.18 in the cases $(\Lambda, \mathfrak{m})$ with n either 1 or 2.

9.3. Conclusion of the proof of Lemma 9.1.18; the case (A.i.2). The main difference between this situation and the previous one is, as already mentioned above, that $p_{11} = 0$. This implies e.g. that the system (9.2.2) does not involve f_k^2 , the system (9.2.3) does not involve f_2^2 . Consequently, we have to add more equations. We shall add the following equations that arise from (9.1.19); in what follows, since we are now dealing with just one case, we shall make the replacement

$$(9.3.1) \quad p_{02}(z, \bar{z}) = \bar{z}_1^2.$$

To the system (9.2.2), we add the equation

$$(9.3.2) \quad iz_1 \bar{z}_1^2 (f_{k+1}^1)' + \bar{z}_1^2 f_{k+2}^2 - \frac{iz_1^2 \bar{z}_1^2}{4} g_k'' = F_{k+2,2} \mod \mathcal{N}_{k+2,1}^3,$$

for $k \geq 3$. To the system (9.2.3) we add

$$(9.3.3) \quad -\frac{z_1^2 \bar{z}_1^3}{2} (f_3^1)'' + iz_1 \bar{z}_1^3 (f_4^2)' + \frac{iz_1^5 \bar{z}_1^3}{6} (\bar{f}_0^2)''' + \frac{z_1^3 \bar{z}_1^3}{12} g_2''' = F_{53} \mod \mathcal{N}_{53}^3.$$

To the systems (9.2.4) and (9.2.5), we add respectively

$$(9.3.4) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -\frac{z_1^2 \bar{z}_1^3}{2} (f_2^1)'' + \frac{iz_1^4 \bar{z}_1^3}{6} (\bar{f}_0^1)''' + iz_1 \bar{z}_1^3 (f_3^2)' \\ \quad -\frac{z_1^4 \bar{z}_1^2}{2} (\bar{f}_1^2)'' + \frac{z_1^3 \bar{z}_1^3}{12} g_1''' = F_{43} \mod \mathcal{N}_{43}^3 \\ -\frac{iz_1^3 \bar{z}_1^4}{6} (f_2^1)''' + \frac{z_1^5 \bar{z}_1^4}{24} (\bar{f}_0^1)^{(4)} - \frac{z_1^2 \bar{z}_1^4}{2} (f_3^2)'' \\ \quad + \frac{iz_1^5 \bar{z}_1^3}{6} (\bar{f}_1^2)''' + \frac{iz_1^4 \bar{z}_1^4}{48} g_1^{(4)} = F_{54} \mod \mathcal{N}_{54}^3. \end{array} \right.$$

$$(9.3.5) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{z_1^3 \bar{z}_1^3}{3} \operatorname{Im} (\bar{z}_1 (f_1^1)''') - z_1^2 \bar{z}_1^2 \operatorname{Re} (\bar{z}_1^2 (f_2^2)'') - \frac{z_1^4 \bar{z}_1^4}{24} \operatorname{Im} g_0^{(4)} = F_{44} \mod \mathcal{N}_{44}^3 \\ \frac{z_1^4 \bar{z}_1^4}{12} \operatorname{Re} (\bar{z}_1 (f_1^1)^{(4)}) + \frac{z_1^3 \bar{z}_1^3}{3} \operatorname{Im} (\bar{z}_1^2 (f_2^2)''') - \frac{z_1^5 \bar{z}_1^5}{120} \operatorname{Re} g_0^{(5)} = F_{55} \mod \mathcal{N}_{55}^3. \end{array} \right.$$

The systems of differential equations so obtained (by adding the above to the systems in §9.2) can be solved if we define the space $\mathcal{N}^3$ as in §3, and the solution (f^1, f^2, g) is unique if we require it to be in $\mathcal{G}_0^2$ as defined in the paragraph preceding Lemma 9.1.18. The proof of this proceeds along the same lines as the proof in the previous section although, due to the fact that these systems have more equations, the calculations become a bit more tedious. The modifications, however, are straightforward and the details are left to the reader. As mentioned above, this also completes the proof of Theorem B. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [BER1] M. S. Baouendi, P. Ebenfelt and L. P. Rothschild, *Algebraicity of holomorphic mappings between real algebraic sets in $\mathbb{C}^N$* , Acta Math. **177** (1996), 225–273.
- [BER2] ———, *Infinitesimal CR automorphisms of real analytic manifolds in complex space*, *Complex Analysis and Geometry* (Cambridge, MA, 1994), 1–14, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

- [BER3] ———, *Parametrization of local biholomorphisms of real analytic hypersurfaces*, Asian J. Math., (to appear).
- [BER4] ———, *Real manifolds in complex space*, (in preparation; preliminary title).
- [BJT] M. S. Baouendi, H. Jacobowitz and F. Treves, *On the analyticity of CR mappings*, Ann. of Math. **122** (1985), 365–400.
- [BS] D. Burns, Jr. and S. Shnider, *Real hypersurfaces in complex manifolds*, Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics XXX, Part 2, Several Complex Variables, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1977, pp. 141–168.
- [C1] E. Cartan, *Sur la géométrie pseudo-conforme des hypersurfaces de deux variables complexes, I*, Ann. Math. Pura Appl. **11** (1932), 17–90, (or Oeuvres II, 1231–1304).
- [C2] ———, *Sur la géométrie pseudo-conforme des hypersurfaces de deux variables complexes, II*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa **1** (1932), 333–354, (or Oeuvres III, 1217–1238).
- [CM] S.-S. Chern and J.K. Moser, *Real hypersurfaces in complex manifolds*, Acta Math. **133** (1974), 219–271.
- [F] M. Freeman, *Real submanifolds with degenerate Levi form*, Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics XXX, part I, Several Complex Variables, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1977.
- [P] H. Poincaré, *Les fonctions analytiques de deux variables et la représentation conforme*, Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo, II. Ser. **23** (1907), 185–220.
- [S] N. Stanton, *Infinitesimal CR automorphisms of rigid hypersurfaces*, Amer. J. Math. **117** (1995), 141–167.
- [T1] N. Tanaka, *On the pseudo-conformal geometry of hypersurfaces of the space of n complex variables*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **14** (1962), 397–429.
- [T2] ———, *On generalized graded Lie algebras and geometric structures. I*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **19** (1967), 215–254, (erratum **36**, p. 1568).
- [W] S. M. Webster, *The holomorphic contact geometry of a real hypersurface*, Modern Methods in Complex Analysis (T. Bloom et al, eds.), Annals of Mathematics Studies 137, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1995, pp. 327–342.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ROYAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, 100 44 STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN

E-mail address: ebenfelt@math.kth.se